The Christian East

CHRONICLE AND CAUSERIE.

OUR FRONTISPIECE.

WE pique ourselves on the appropriateness of the portraits of distinguished Eastern hierarchs and theologians with which we have presented our readers as frontispieces during the past three years. In every case they have served in some measure to change a familiar name into a personality and to help Anglicans to visualize those leaders of Eastern Christianity who are making history. Thus we have already reproduced photos of a dozen such "men of the hour" as the Œcumenical Patriarch Meletios, the Catholicos Sahag, the Metropolitan Chrysostom of Athens, the Patriarch Damianos, etc., etc. In this issue we are happy to give that of one whose name has been very much before the British public these two years past. Whatever friend or foe may say of him, there can be no doubt but that the Metropolitan Anthony of Kiev is a man who counts. If you open Mr. McCullagh's skilful propagandist panegyric of the Polish Papal Colony in Russia and depreciation of the native Christianity of that martyred country, *The Bolshevik Persecution of Christianity in Russia*, or Père M. d'Herbigny's even more subtly malignant *L'Anglicanisme et l'Orthodoxie gréco-slav*, you will find the Metropolitan well written down. Farm Street is shrewd enough to foresee its obstacles, though, as the *Church Times* once put it, it generally copies the bird that by fluttering its wing too much shows the nester where its eggs are. No greater testimony to the Metropolitan's influence could be rendered than is given by the Jesuit's anxiety to convince us that he neither has nor ought to have any. On the other hand, in the Orthodox World itself, there can be no doubt but that few men count for more than the Metropolitan. Read *Gregorios Palamas*, the official magazine of the Antiochene Patriarchate, the Alexandrine *Pantænos*, or any other of an autokephalous Orthodox Church, and you will certainly find mention of him. As to whether he be right or wrong, is not the business of an Anglican, but there is no doubt but that he is the centre and the forefront to the opposition to the

change of the Kalendar and the other reforms recommended by the Constantinople Pan-Orthodox Conference of last May and to the person of the ex-Patriarch Meletios. Further, while he is friendly to us Anglicans, he represents the most conservative and cautious school of Orthodox Theology. Thus, when he writes to the *Church Times* to say that for his own part, granted it were to be received as *de jure ecclesiastico* and not as *de jure divino*, he would be prepared to invest the Pope with a dazzling Supremacy that might well satisfy any pretension, the merest tyro may be sure that he is not acting the opportunist but is speaking as one who has behind him all the centuries of reasoned and safeguarded Orthodox Theology. *Ruat cœlum, sed fiat justitia.* As Gennadios Scholarios, and the Greeks of the year 1453, went into a Gehenna of Oppression rather than accept the Papal interpretation of the ambiguous ambipedipulating formularies with which Joseph II. reckoned that he had tricked poor unlettered Pope Eugenius IV. at Florence-Ferrara in 1439, so the Metropolitan in this Year of Grace 1924, would sooner see the Bolshevik triumphant in his terroristic usurpation of the government of his beloved native land, or Mustapha Kemal thrice worthy of the title of the Ghazi—*i.e.*, of the hero who, aided by the apathy of Europe and the treachery of the *libre penseur* France of M. Poincaré, sacked Smyrna, martyred its "Angel," extirpated Christianity from Asia Minor and quenched the light of the Lamps of the Pauline and Johannine Churches—destroy the *omphalos* of the Orthodox World, the Œcumenical Patriarchate, rather than compromise in an iota that Orthodox Faith and its principles which have been passed down to the present day without "addition, subtraction or alteration" from the times of the Christ and His Apostles. So also, when, as the result of scientific investigation, he states, as he stated in the compelling question which he recently propounded in the Belgrad *Novoe Vedemosti*, the inevitability of the proposition that in the event of Reunion, the Orthodox Churches must accept Anglican Bishops, Priests and Deacons in their Orders, he is not, as Father Michel d'Herbigny and the other successors of the late Dr. A. Fortescue would have the world believe, cutting his cloth to suit his customer, but is expressing the matured opinion of one who is a theologian in the most meticulous sense of that often exploited term and who would die rather than adapt the expression of his conviction to the passing exigencies of the opportunism of the day.

We take this biographical sketch from the *Tserkovniya Viedemosti* of Karlowicz for 15/28 August, 1923: "The Metropolitan Anthony, who before becoming a monk was known as Alexios Chranovitsky, was born 17 March, 1863. After the conclusion of his course at the Fifth Petrograd Gymnasium in 1881, he studied at the Petrograd Spiritual Academy and on the completion of its curriculum in 1885,

changed his name to Anthony in honour of Saint Anthony Remlyanin, the miracle-worker, of Novgorod. On the 15 August in the same year he was appointed a salaried teacher, and in September assistant inspector, of the Academy. In 1886 he was transferred at his own request to the Seminary of Kholm as lecturer and, after the lapse of a further year, was appointed Professor by the Council of the Petrograd Academy with the Chair of Old Testament History, defending his Magisterial thesis three months later, the subject being "Psychological Data in regard to the Exercise of Free-will and Moral Responsibility," which ran to three editions. He next filled the position of Rector of the Petrograd Spiritual Academy with the rank of Archimandrite, and then successively that of Rector of the Moscow and Kazan Spiritual Academies. Having been consecrated Bishop in 1897 while still Rector of the Kazan Academy, he was appointed diocesan of Ufa in 1900, was transferred to the see of Volhynia in 1902, and in 1906 was raised to the dignity of Archbishop and nominated a member of the Imperial Council. In 1910 the Œcumenical Patriarch made him his legate for Galicia and Carpathian Russia, which office he retained when he became Metropolitan of Kiev. In 1912 he was nominated a permanent member of the Sacred Governing Synod, and in 1914 was translated to the see of Kharkov.

The Metropolitan had previously been elected to the management of more than one institution of historical importance. Thus in 1897 he had been made President of the Pan-Russian Missionary Association at Kazan and in 1908 President of the similar Association at Kiev. It was on his initiative that in 1911 a set of statutes for the control of Ecclesiastical Educational Institutions was worked out by a Commission in which he took part, and approved by the Synod and the Emperor. Honorary membership of the four Spiritual Academies was also conferred upon him. In 1913, with the approval of the Holy Synod, he was advanced to the Doctorate of Divinity by the Council of the Spiritual Academy of Kazan.

On learning, March 4, 1917, of the Tsar's abdication, the Metropolitan at once informed his clergy in synod that he purposed resignation, and sent a letter to that effect to the Holy Synod. His intention had been to reside at the monastery of Svyatogor, but the revolutionary Committee of Kharkov protested against his presence at a distance of only 120 versts—about 80 miles—and he was compelled to change his choice to the Balaam Monastery, where he had taken the habit exactly 32 years before, entering it on the 11 May, 1915, only after having used the strongest words to press his request for permission upon the Holy Synod, which desired to keep him in active service and had refused its consent. In August of the same year he took part in the All-Russian Church Council as delegate of the

Association of the Monasteries of Russia. The election of a new Archbishop of Kharkov taking place at that time, he was re-elected to the see by an overwhelming majority—420 out of 460—and on his arrival at that city was received by the people as in triumph.

In the All-Russian Church Council the Metropolitan was the originator as well as the chief champion of the reconstitution of the Patriarchate for Russia, a measure accepted by the Council only after a prolonged conflict. The Metropolitan in fact had pressed for the convention of an All-Russian Church Council at an earlier period of his career, *e.g.*, as far back as the sessions of the Holy Synod between 1904-1911, in which he took part. Thus, when the Metropolitan Anthony of Petrograd withdrew on the receipt of a rescript rejecting the project from K. P. Pobiedonostiev, he took charge of the presentation of a memorandum in which the Holy Synod petitioned unanimously for the convention of such a Council and the reconstitution of the Patriarchate. Three candidates were selected for the Patriarchal Throne, the first being the then Archbishop Anthony, the second Archbishop Arsenios of Novgorod and the third the Metropolitan Tikhon of Moscow. The final choice was made by lot and fell upon the Metropolitan Tikhon.

A few days after his election the Patriarch in his Synod advanced Archbishop Anthony and four other archbishops to the rank of Metropolitan.

In May, 1918, the Kiev Diocesan Synod and subsequently the All-Ukranian Church Synod elected the Metropolitan to the Throne of Kiev and Galicia, which dignity carried with it permanent membership of the Patriarchal Synod.

The Metropolitan, however, was unable to remain longer than six months in Kiev. Petliur, the creature of the Jesuits, made a forcible entry into the town, effected his arrest and that of the Metropolitan Evlogios and sent them under escort to the Galician town of Buchan, where both bishops, and with them subsequently Bishop Nichodim, the Archimandrite Vitalios of Pochaev and the Priest-Monk Tikhon (Sharapov) were interned in an Uniate Monastery.

On the occupation of Buchan by the Poles, the imprisoned Archbishops petitioned the Polish Government for their full restoration to the exercise of their episcopal function—in Galicia in the first instance, and then in the country districts of Volhynia. But instead of the granting of that most lawful and reasonable request, the three bishops were again arrested and packed off, through streaming rain, in open farm waggons to a suburb of Cracow, where they were kept in stringent confinement in the Latin Monastery of the Kamedulites.

They were, however, released in August, 1919, on the intervention

of the Entente, and made their way back to Russia through Roumania, Constantinople and Novorossia.

The Metropolitan Anthony spent the next two months in Kiev, but the city was occupied by the Bolsheviks during his absence at Novocherkassk as the representative of the Presiding Court for the trial of a certain Bishop. In consequence he was obliged to accompany the Volunteer Army to the South-East, where on account of the departure of the local bishops he administered for a time the dioceses, first of Kuban and then of the Black Sea. He quitted those towns on the day of the Bolsheviks' entry into them, leaving Novorossia on March 13. From Novorossia he travelled with the Army to the Crimea, whence the Greeks deported him to Athens, inducing him to go aboard their steamer in order to conduct a Service on the Liberation of Constantinople and the Setting up the Cross over St. Sophia. Afterwards they confessed that they had tricked him in order to deport him to Athens. The Bolshevik bombardment of the city had then commenced. So the Metropolitan submitted to fortune.

At Athens, where he stayed only three weeks, he enjoyed the warm hospitality of the Metropolitan, the present Œcumenical Patriarch Meletios. Proceeding to Mount Athos, he then entered the Monastery of Panteleimon, where he hoped to end his days, but on September 6 received a telegraphic invitation from General Vrangel to return to Russia to reconstitute the Church in the Crimea which had not submitted to the Bolsheviks.

He saw no probability of the Volunteer Army's making good, but, judging that to refuse the call would be a shameful dereliction started at once for the Crimea. Forty days after his arrival, however, its evacuation by Vrangel's army left him no choice but to go with it to Constantinople, where he made application for permission to return to Mount Athos. Receiving a refusal from the Greeks of Athos, he availed himself of a thrice repeated invitation from the Patriarch Dmitri of Servia where he arrived on February 14, 1921.

It will be well to give a summary of the learned works of the Metropolitan, many of which were printed first in magazines and were published in a collection, the first edition appearing in 1906, the second in 1911. Among them the more noteworthy are his Lectures on Pastoral Theology, his Expositions of the Capital Doctrines of the Faith (the Trinity, Redemption, etc.), his polemics with Soloviev, L. Tolstoy, the Stundists, Uniates, certain Old Believers and other heretics, his Tract on the Anglican Episcopate, and especially his Treatise on "Christ the Saviour and the Jewish Revolution" and his "Dictionary of the Works of Dostoievsky," which latter has been translated into French, besides many others which have been translated into English, French, German, Greek and Tartar.

Of the 3,000 and more sermons of the Metropolitan Anthony that which attracted the most attention was one delivered at the Isaac Cathedral in Petrograd in February, 1905, in which he declared that if the autocracy were overthrown Russia would not last as a single great Empire for twenty years, but would split up into little fragments. In that case, the preacher averred, the further consequence would ensue that she would fall under the rod of men who hated her people and who would begin by forbidding the Teaching of God's Law in her schools and would go on to destroy her fanes, to tear the bodies of her Saints from their shrines and to place them in anatomical museums. That, he said, is what our simulated friends expect with impatience while our implacable enemies of Western Europe with the avidity of hawks wait until, when those things are brought to pass, they may gather and descend upon our Fatherland and turn it into a second India.

That Sermon was reported in "Tserkovniya Viedemosti" at the time and was subsequently included in the preacher's collected works.

The Bishop's words have proved prophetic. He was mistaken only in the period of time which he designated. Only twelve years after that sermon, his prophecy was fulfilled.

The Metropolitan and Anglican Ordinations.

So late as last August the Metropolitan Anthony ordained a French Canadian, a M. Côté, who many years ago received deacon's orders from an Anglican bishop and had been long associated with the Russians in Palestine. In so ordaining him he ordained him deacon as well as priest. We can quite imagine the Editor of the *Tablet*, or even Father Woodlock, S.J., chuckling and taking up pen and paper on reading this. An Anglican Deacon reordained by the Orthodox! What an indiscretion of the *Christian East* to publish the fact!! Here's conclusive evidence that the Russian Church "rejects" Anglican Ordinations. Of course it does nothing of the kind. The mistake under which the late Dr. Fortescue laboured, and which is perpetuated seemingly among his colleagues of Henrietta Street, is the imagining that the Orthodox have accepted the developments of Western Theology. They appear incapable of realising that Orthodox Outlook and Practice are regulated by principles which belong to a period before the germs of those developments existed. If they could grasp that fact, what is now a chaos to them would become logical and precise. Thus the Orthodox have no cut-and-dried obligation to pronounce that some Orders are valid *per se* and that others are not. They are not confronted with the necessity of "acceptance" or "rejection." In the case of "heterodox"

ordinations, such as Roman or Anglican, they are free to accept them or, even though they possess all the outward marks of the Apostolic Succession, to refuse to do so. Rejection is not a synonym to them as to the Papalist, for non-acceptance. Thus within the past century the Œcumenical Patriarchate itself rebaptized, reconfirmed, and reordained a Papalist Bishop in all three grades. Reception of adherents to Orthodoxy in their Orders or their reordination is to the Orthodox a matter in which the Church is at liberty as a wise steward to exercise discretion or economy. That that happens to be the explanation of the Metropolitan Anthony's action in the case of M. Côté is more than an obvious deduction. One of our editors chanced to be in Belgrad a few days after the event and addressed a respectful enquiry to the Metropolitan himself, who replied at once that, since the Russian Patriarch had not pronounced on Anglican Ordinations, he felt bound not to create a precedent and that, though Roman Orders possessed the outward marks of Apostolic Succession, he should reordain any Roman priest or bishop who came to him, even the Pope himself. For his own part he had judged that Anglican Ordinations were at least as valid as those of the Papal Obedience. Since then he has published his opinion in trenchant form in an article in the Belgrad *Novoye Vremya*, which concluded with these words: **"Would it be possible in the event of their Reunion with the Church to refuse the Anglican Episcopate that which was conceded to the Nestorians and the Donatists by the Council of Carthage and by Basil the Great—that is to say, reception into unity by the Third Rite and with Recognition in their existing Order?"**

For Ministers of bodies the Baptism of which does not present the possibility of acceptance, the Orthodox use the "First Rite," which includes Baptism. For Ministers of bodies the Baptism of which presents the possibility of acceptance but which have no sufficient marks of Apostolic Succession, they use the "Second Rite," which includes Chrismation and Ordination. The "Third Rite," which includes only the renunciation of error, is used for Ministers whose Baptism and Ordination are acceptable.

A Personal Impression of the Metropolitan.

The Editor to whom we refer above gives his impression of the Metropolitan Anthony as follows: "Of middle height, clear-skinned and robust for all his years and their experience, the Metropolitan is a scholar and a refined gentleman *au bout d'ongle*. Possessed of a quiet and pretty sense of humour, rich in knowledge of the world and of men, he makes a singularly agreeable and instructive companion. Moreover, he is simplicity itself and refuses to allow those whom he honours with his society, to treat him (even though they

cannot forget the fact) as the great man and highly placed ecclesiastic that he is. Though he is essentially a man of affairs and might well have been for his skill in reading men and situations a mediæval cardinal, he is heart and soul a monk. At Karlowicz he haunts the Cathedral. He was at the 4.30 a.m. office no less regularly than the mid-day. Assuredly it is not affectation which makes him express a passionate desire for the life of prayer and seclusion of Mount Athos as his dearest wish. None the less I have enjoyed few more pleasant or profitable evenings than those in which at the Serbian Patriarchate he admitted me to long *têtes à têtes*."

The Metropolitan Anthony and the Living Church.

Bolshevik, Polish and Uniate propaganda conspire to represent the Patriarch Tikhon, in the words of Capt. McCullagh, as a " weak man." To judge by the failure of their attacks on the Russian Church none of them have found him so. But even if their wish has been father to their thought in regard to the Patriarch, they will not venture to accuse the Metropolitan Anthony of weakness. He has been the active centre of the Russian exiles and, as Head of the extra-Russian Synod for Europe, has shown a stern front under often the most difficult conditions these four years past to all three of them. A type of his action may be found in this brisk correspondence between himself and Evdokim, " Metropolitan of Odessa," at present the chief leader of the Bolshevik Living Church Administration. The letters are illustrative of much and we think the space spent on their reprinting in full well used.

The Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church. President. September 12th, 1923. No. 136. To the former Metropolitan of Kiev, Anthony Chrapovitzky.

With a feeling of deep affliction and in accordance with the duty of service for the purpose of avoiding greater trouble to you and those about you, I am compelled to inform you that by the Council of 1923, and with the consultation of 67 Bishops, you were deprived of holy dignity and of every right to administer Russian Churches, even outside of Russia.

I strongly advise you to obey me, because I do not want to say anything unpleasant to you. The former Patriarch Tikhon, having understood his complete entanglement, made to the Holy Synod his statement about reconciliation with the clergy and the people who separated from him. The Commission, composed both of his and of our representatives, by the mouth even of his ardent defender, Bishop Ilarion, pronounced this decision concerning him : " To resign his full power, to retire to a monastery and to await the trial of the Council of Bishops." This resolution was put into his hands. There is no other solution and cannot be.

I would like to ask all of you to bring to the Council of Bishops statements concerning the re-examination of your work. By God's help I hope that this work will be re-examined and considered favourably for you. Think well concerning yourself. What are you awaiting there ? All is over for ever. Therefore we must work amidst new conditions of life. I must tell you honestly that our Government is struggling not with the Church, but with the counter-revolution and with counter-

revolutionaries and with the conscienceless exploitation of the ignorant masses; but what Government in all the world is not ready to struggle with such conditions? I raised the Church life in Nijni-Novgorod to an altitude such as it did not know in the Czar's time. I saved all the 32 monasteries and was not subject to any disagreeableness on the part of the civil powers. Please understand, I did not sell any Church property, I did not give up a single iota, I was simply honest and loyal in my attitude to the civil authorities.

I now know very definitiely that there is a possibility even for the re-examination of laws regarding the relationship of the Church and State, because the present laws were made during the days of the great counter-revolutionary activity of our clergy against our civil authorities.

Our country is being rebuilt very rapidly; amazing, hot and feverish activity is going on everywhere. In the course of the next three years it will be difficult to recognize our country, owing to the prosperity and power which it will attain. Foreigners who have come to Russia agree to this.

You know the situation of Church affairs in Russia from the letters of the Holy Synod to the Eastern Patriarchs and to the Russian people. Give attention only to the fact that both these documents were written a month ago. Life has moved forward very rapidly during this time and a great many things are changing for the better. Once again I would ask you to consider my letter carefully, free from every "Ideology" which has hitherto prevented you from a simple, clear, unprejudiced understanding of things. A right consideration of this letter will bring nothing but good to you and to God's Church.

Your obedient and devoted servant,

EVDOKIM,

Metropolitan of Odessa and Cherson.

The following answer was sent by the Metropolitan Antonios: TO THE ONE WHO CALLS HIMSELF METROPOLITAN EVDOKIM, BUT WHO REALLY IS VASSILI IVANOVITCH MESCHERSKY:

In answer to your impertinent letter I send you the resolution of the Russian Orthodox Synod (with jurisdiction outside of Russia) from which it is clearly seen that you and your companions, because of the crimes which you have committed, as evident breakers and destroyers of the Canons of the Church, already in virtue of your works themselves, and deprived of holy dignity and, according to the 15th Canon of the Sixth General Council, are totally stripped of priesthood, that is to say, you can never be restored to your former holy dignity and, beginning from the 23rd of May, 1923, you with all your followers are excommunicated from the Holy Church by the Council of the Russian Hierarchy outside of Russia.

You admonish me to forsake my ideology and to become convinced that all is over. Yes, for you all is over, God's existence, the immortality of man's soul and the future beyond the trial of the grave, is over for you, but I am keeping true to the old ideology to which you also formerly adhered, namely, "I believe in the One God, Father Almighty, etc.," and I refuse to take the Utilitarian point of view. For this reason I am little interested in the question as to whether the Jewish Government of Russia will be changed or not, and I will not adhere to your "sly church." Of course you lie regarding the repentance of the Patriarch and of Bishop Ilarion in your Church. Likewise, you lie in regard to all that you say in your letter, and if the Patriarch should adhere to the Living Church which now has married bishops who are not bishops and twice married priests who are false priests, I imitate the example of St. Maxim, Confessor of the Faith, who, having been cast into prison and severely tormented, and having known that all the four bishops and the Emperor had joined the Monothelites and taken sacrament, cried, "If all the world takes the sacrament with them, I alone will not partake of the sacrament!"

Of course, for you it is now very difficult not to give up all your former holy convictions in every step of your life. Having lovers and illegitimate children, you are necessarily compelled constantly to look about you and to seek to escape detection, dismissal and poverty.

But be sure that the only way to save your soul from eternal perdition as well as that of your companions—heretics and Separatists, is to tear off your bishop's vestments and cassock, to wear your priestly underrobes and a leather belt, and to enter the Orthodox monastery as a penitent lay-brother. Then a stone of painful remorse will fall from your heart and to you, through penitent tears, will be opened the door through which came the Gospel robber, who sinned less than you. He entered first, but may God permit you through tearful repentance to enter, even though it be one of the last.

The last lie of your letter and of your miserable and illegal assemblies which you held is the justification of your government, as if it were struggling not with the Church but with the counter-revolution. How disloyal you are to conscience when you speak so about the government which closed the Ouspensky Cathedral, destroyed the Holy Relics, permitted the publishing of the newspaper *Without God* and organized comic religious processions!

And is it possible that you do not understand that foreigners and even little children do not believe these dishonest and foolish justifications? All the world knows already that Bolshevism is primarily a malicious enemy of the faith of Christ. Moreover, foreigners interested in the Russian Church a long time ago read my published letters to the effect that your false council of impostors held in Moscow has the same meaning as the strident voices of several market women, and even less than these, if the women are Orthodox and not Separatists like you yourself and your miserable and illegal assembly.

Repent! the span of our life is short indeed, and though you are my pupil and, alas, though you took the veil from me, you are almost 55 years old and because of your feebleness you cannot live a long time; and on the Judgment Day neither Jews nor nihilistic priests will support you.

Your well-wisher,

ANTONIOS,
Metropolitan of Kiev.

THE ŒCUMENICAL PATRIARCHATE.

Our latest news from Constantinople shows that things remain in suspense. The Angora Government has neither shown further hostility to the Phanar nor has it entered into relations with it. It has simply ignored it, the general explanation probably being that it waits the ratification of the Lausanne Treaty and the subsequent reopening of full relations with Europe before deciding its course. Apart from that, however, its hands are sufficiently full with the opposition which its abolition of the Khalifate has generated abroad and its handling of the conservative Moslem element throughout Turkey has consolidated at home. There are signs, indeed, that the Bolshevik members of the *Mejlis*, the majority of whom are not Turks but Russian Tartars, and who number about a score, have made a bold bid to create an open rupture between the Moslem Religion and the New Turkey. The secularization of the State is the instrument and the confiscation of the vast property of the *Evkaf*,

on religious foundations, the inducement by which they are at work. It is not impossible that if Kemal were overthrown or (for the Ghazi is a man of violent moods) swung in one of his fits of impulse to the Soviet side, that we might witness an Angorian War against Religion of the *Bezbojdnik* pattern. To say the least, the Ulemas are uneasy, alarmed and nervously anxious as to the future, while the Indian Moslem, who saved Mustapha Kemal in 1921 by his diversion, is openly indignant at the jettisoning of that Khalifate which he declared necessary for the existence of Islam. We have no space, however, here to expatiate on the general situation in Turkey, but note that "Papa" Eftim has initiated a series of criminal libel actions against the Patriarch and the Metropolitans of the Synod for unfrocking him, and in one of them has already gained a Pyrrhic victory to the tune of what in London would be a farthing damages.

A threat from Angora has compelled the Patriarchate to cease to use the Stavropegion, the double-headed eagle, for its crest. Current certificates, *e.g.*, for marriage, being on paper already in hand, have a Greek Cross superimposed on the ancient emblem of the Byzantine Cæsars. We trust the eclipse will not be permanent.

The Change of Kalendar.

We confess that the forecast in our last issue was mistaken. The Constantinople Patriarchate and with it the Churches of Greece, Serbia and Roumania adopted the New Kalendar on March 10th. We have no information as to what has happened in Russia or the other three Patriarchates or Cyprus.

The "Velehgrad Conference."

The *Tablet* having stated that a Conference between representative Orthodox and Roman Catholic theologians will take place next July at Velehgrad, in Czecho-Slovakia, we have made enquiry and find that no Orthodox Church will be represented at any such gathering. If held, the Conference will be attended chiefly by Latins and Uniates and will be directed by Mgr. Shepitsky, who is in charge of the Uniate campaign in White Russia and the lands adjacent, and Father d'Herbigny, the Director of the Papal Oriental Institute of Rome. Its scope will be the study of the best presentment of the Papal Claims to the Russian Church with a view to its uniatisation. We would it were otherwise.

Mar Timotheos.

The sorrows and the betrayal of Britain's smallest ally, the Assyrian Church and nation, brought some of us this good. While Mar Timotheos, Metropolitan of Malabar, was staying in the quiet, gentle hospitality of the Cowley Fathers in Westminster, we were able—a rare privilege nowadays—to assist at his Celebration of the Qurbana and to practise our slow lips in the beautiful tongue which

was our Lord's vernacular and threatens soon to cease to be spoken except as a souvenir. We were never more ashamed, however, than when we bade the Metropolitan good-bye at Waterloo as he started to keep Easter in Chicago, where there is a little congregation of Assyrians and a church—there is none in Europe—with the Rev. G. Azoo as priest. Mar Timotheos is, of course, a pure Syrian. How he came to be sent to India may be read below in Mr. Hunt's article. We hope soon to publish his Mappaq b'Rucha, *i.e.*, apology against the charge of Christological heresy, in an early issue. We fear that he left England heart-sick with disappointment at the fending from pillar to post which he had experienced. He was here to plead that Great Britain, which summoned the people of Mar Shimun to help her in 1916, must either guarantee the survivors in their own land to the north of Iraq, or if she will not do that, must find a "homeland" for them in America or Australia, where they can live their Syrian life and preserve their nation and Church. Impossible though it seems, that demand has not been granted. The tragedy is that the so-called Chaldæans, *i.e.*, a small fraction of the nation which became Uniate in the 18th century, have not only remained unharmed by the Turk as a reward for keeping out of the War, but have possessed themselves of some of the villages belonging to the majority who were our eager allies. Of the latter about 30,000 are with Lady Sarma and her nephew, the present Mar Shimun, a lad of 16, near Mosul. Another 50,000 are scattered over the face of the earth. If they cannot return to their native homes or do not receive fresh lands where they may find rest for their souls in the fashion of their fathers, then the survivors will settle down in America and so on, and a generation hence their language, religion, race and patriotism will be only a memory. Meanwhile this letter shows that they are in grave danger and very indignant at the attempt to fob them off with the League of Nations as a substitute for the British guarantee given them in 1915.

If Great Britain will withdraw from this country (*i.e.*, Iraq), then we will not remain. What has been done by the League of Nations? It will treat us as it treated the Armenians. The League of Nations is a cradle of death to the small nations. The great Governments want to free themselves from the responsibilities and promises given to the small nations in the time of the war. If Great Britain withdraws, can the poor Assyrians maintain any self-government in the midst of Islam? Arab, on one side, Kurd, Turk, and Persian on the other sides . . . Turkish troops are increasing in number on the Jezirah side. The Kurds are more openly saying that Mosul will go to Turkey. The Arabs, too, are not quite so well pleased with the British as reports tell us.

The Christians of Mardin are driven out. The Jacobite Patriarch has been divested of his position.

If the Kemalist forces cross over to this side they will not ask the League of Nations as to what to do but they will do as they did in Smyrna under the nose of the League of Nations.

Britannia is responsible for us.

Mar Shimun.

Mar Shimun himself is the nephew of the last Mar Shimun, who died in 1919 of consumption aggravated by the dangers and hardships of the trek which followed the Turkish invasion of his country in 1918. The story of his brother's murder by the Kurd Simko and the trek may be read in his sister, Lady Surma's "Assyrian Church Customs"—a wonderfully human and valuable document, published by the Faith Press. The present Mar Shimun is, of course, the civil as well as the ecclesiastical head of his people—there was talk in 1919 of separating the functions, *i.e.*, of choosing another Patriarch and letting the lad be only the Prince of his people, but nothing was done. In consequence he was consecrated Bishop. He is, of course, a "Nazarite," and not only cannot marry but must not eat flesh or drink wine. Report says that he wished to go to an English school, an obvious impossibility for a Bishop. We hope to see him by-and-by in London.

As we go to Press we have bad news of the Turks' treatment of the unhappy Jacobites.

Greek Version of the Prayer Book.

The Greek translation of our Prayer Book adds another to the long list of services—among them the inception of the *Christian East* in 1920—rendered to our movement by S.P.C.K., which kindly placed a couple of dozen copies at our disposal for circulation in the Near East. Among those that have written enthusiastic acknowledgments are the Œcumenical Patriarch Gregory, who begs that Russian, Serb, Roumanian and Arab versions should also be prepared; the Patriarch Meletios, who wrote cheerily from his solitary hospice of Mylopotamos at Mount Athos; the Patriarch Damianos, the Archbishop of Cyprus, who alone signs in purple ink—why *will* not the British Government snub the Quai d'Orsay and restore the island to its Motherland?—Professor Ispir of Bucharest who, by the way, was in England in March for the World Alliance; the Metropolitan Chrysostom of Athens, and the Metropolitan of Durazzo, a stout Constantinople friend of the Anglo-Orthodox entente.

Meeting of Prelates in Jerusalem.

The Metropolitan Anthony of Kiev is now in Jerusalem, for which city he left Belgrad on April 2nd, 1915, having a great send-off at the station from the Patriarch Dmitri and the Serb Church as well as from the colony of Russian exiles. As the Patriarch Photios is due in the Holy Land before Whitsuntide, an important meeting of the three prelates seems probable.

The Patriarch Tikhon.

The following contraverts the interested pessimistic reports which have been rashly credited by some usually well informed papers:

"The Patriarch has recovered from his recent kidney trouble, an illness which was never so serious as stated in some organs of the Press. It is true that he suffers occasionally from fainting fits, but they pass quickly, and he both transacts business and conducts religious services. When he does the latter, the churches cannot hold the huge congregations which assemble. The Central Executive Committee has quashed the proceedings instituted by the Bolsheviks not only against the Patriarch but also against the Metropolitan Arsenios and Mr. V. Guriev, who is in charge of the Holy Synod. In its decision it referred to the prelates by their secular names and styled the Church 'the so-called Orthodox Church.' The Metropolitan Sergios was released from prison in January and went to reside at Nishni-Novgorod, but came to Moscow in March, where the agents of the Bolsheviks suggested that he should form a new Church which might embrace all the different sections. While he was in Moscow, however, he assisted at the Patriarch's Liturgy, having first made a public act of penitence for his dealings with the Living Church, the Superior Control of which he had recognised in 1922. In conditions of striking solemnity he knelt, dressed in the robe of a simple monk, before the Patriarch, who received him, raised him up, blessed him and put the Klopuk on him again. Eye-witnesses describe his thus doing penance in the sight of the multitude as worthy of the earliest days of the Church and as an extraordinarily moving scene . . . The Patriarch and his Synod are at work preparing for the convocation of a Local Council of the Russian Orthodox Church, which apparently will be held this year. His Beatitude is a strong advocate of the holding such a Council to deal with the strengthening of the organisation of the Church with the problem of the Kalendar. The Council will also consider the relations of Russians abroad to the Church at home. The persecution of the Orthodox Church goes on as before, but fear of angering the populace constrains the Bolsheviks in many places to carry it on in disguised fashions. The Œcumenical Patriarch Gregory has been recognised by the Patriarch who, however, has refused on account of the opposition of the people to accept the New Kalendar."—*Tserkovniya Viedemosti*, April 15th-28th.

Bishop Gibson. R.I.P.

The death of Dr. E. C. Gibson, late Bishop of Gloucester, on March 9th, will cause genuine regret not only to us Anglicans but to the many Orthodox prelates with whom he came in contact. Dr. Gibson took the keenest interest in Eastern Christianity and, busy though he was, grudged no demand on his time to serve our movement. For example, he was Chairman of the Committee of the 1920 Lambeth Conference which received and conferred with the Constantinople Delegation. Also, he rarely missed a session of the Archbishop's Eastern Churches Committee. That none of the journalistic notices of his death referred to this phase of his activity was partly because he was above everything averse from publicity and partly because his work touched so many spheres. Nevertheless we may be pardoned for thinking that it was as important as any that he enterprised. We shall miss his wise counsel and burning though quiet enthusiasm. R.I.P.

Bishop Nicholai.

Our long-tried and dear friend Bishop Nicholai Velimirovic has been for some months back in his own out-of-the way and rather wild—be it confessed—diocese of Ochrida, down in the romantic and beautiful South-West corner of Serbia. Needless to say, he rejoices that at last the insistence which kept him at Belgrad has been relaxed and that he is free to be a Bishop rather than an administrator. We should love to see him with the simple folk whom he loves so well.

Personal Notes and Happenings.

The Rev. F. N. Heazell, Vicar of St. Michael's, Croydon, has succeeded the Rev. H. J. Fynes-Clinton as Secretary of the Archbishop's Eastern Churches Committee. He gives his services gratis.

One and all of us were delighted at the appointment of the Rev. Dr. G. K. A. Bell to the Deanery of Canterbury. What Dr. Bell has been to us these past ten years of his Chaplaincy to his Grace of Canterbury will never be written. We understand that he will in no way be lost to us. We could not spare him. He has in preparation for publication a volume, to be issued by the Oxford Press, of official documents dealing with the Reunion Movements initiated by the Lambeth Conference of 1920.

We record with satisfaction that one of our editors, the Rev. J. A. Douglas, was among those honoured by the University of Athens with a Doctorate of Philosophy in commemoration of the Byron Centenary in April.

The anniversary of the A. and E.A. will be marked on Nov. 11 this year by a Solemn Evensong in the Russian Church of St. Philip and by a Liturgy in the Greek Church of St. Sophia, Moscow Road.

Commander H. C. Luke, who has served as Deputy Governor of Jerusalem since the War, has accepted an important official position in Sierra Leone. While we congratulate him and the Colony, we grieve for our movement. To detail all his activities would need a volume. *Inter alia*, he has been one of the two Commissioners charged with nursing the finances of the Jerusalem Patriarchate, and the report he issued with his colleague, Sir Anton Bertram, is far and away the best historical sketch of the Patriarchate in any western language. Indeed, he has done our cause almost as much good service by his writings as by his activity, *e.g.*, he contributed a charming leader page article to *The Times* of April 16th on Holy Week in Jerusalem. We are confident, that if for a time he is away from the Near East, he will not sin against the light by withholding his pen. He has been added to the Archbishop's E.C.C.

We understand that Professor Bulgakov, the distinguished Russian theologian, will visit England this summer.

We congratulate the Proto Deacon of the Russian Parish of London, Father Theokritov, on the birth of his third son.

The Metropolitan Evlogios has nominated Father Timotheiev to be his special representative to deal with the Anglican Church.

Father Gavin, the author of that best book of its kind in English, "Aspects of Modern Greek Orthodox Theology" (Mowbray), has accepted a Professorship at New York Central Seminary.

Mar Timotheos writes that he had over 300 communicants in Chicago at Easter.

Dr. Emhardt, the "Official Representative" of the American Church towards the Churches of Europe, arrived in London on May 3rd, after a four months' tour in the Near East.

The Kahana (priest) Vahan Khoyan has taken charge of St. Sarkhi's, Iverna Gardens, W., by instruction of the Catholicos of Etchmiadzin.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

To the best of their ability and in the limit of their space the Editors will endeavour to answer enquiries addressed to them.

1. *Is the Orthodox Church tied to a literal interpretation of Holy Scripture?*—No. You will find abundant quotations showing that Orthodox Theologians are prepared to accept demonstrated results of criticism, in Father Gavin's article in the *Christian East*, December, 1922.

2. *Do the Orthodox reserve in one kind?*—No. Their canon law is very stringent. The priest who consecrates must sprinkle the "Lamb" to be reserved with drops of the consecrated species of wine from a spoon.

3. *Are the Armenians really heretical?*—The Armenians have rejected the Council of Chalcedon and its formula of "Two Natures." But the technical Greek theological terms had no exact equivalents in Armenian and the Armenian terms used to translate them did not correspond. It is certain that many Armenian writers did enunciate Monophysism, but there seems good reason to hold that Armenian Christological theology to-day is consentient with that of Orthodoxy and with our own.

4. *What is the difference between a Patriarchate and another Church?*—Of a Patriarchate the Patriarch is the ruler and the symbolistic head. The Synod of his subordinate bishops are there to advise and counsel him according to the canon law. In another Church, *e.g.*, in Athens, the Synod is the ruling body and the presiding bishop is simply its president and chief executive official.

5. *Is the Church of Finland autokephalous?*—No. Up till the War Finland formed part of the Russian Patriarchate and by canon law no autokephalous Church can be formed without the consent of the Church from which it is to be separated. The Patriarch Tikhon has given the Church of Finland, as those of Georgia, Poland, Lithuania, Esthonia and Latvia, autonomy, but they are not autokephalous because he has not abdicated ultimate jurisdiction over them. When he does so, if the Œcumenical Patriarchate recognises them, they will rank as autokephalous Churches, *i.e.*, be under no exterior jurisdiction whatever. But recognition by Constantinople would be insufficient without his consent.

PAPAL ROME AND THE ORTHODOX EAST.

Notes upon the Article published under this heading in the "Christian East" for February, 1924, and written by Monsignor P. Batiffol.

BY THE RIGHT REV. BISHOP CHARLES GORE, D.D.

Monsignor Batiffol's article to which this is a "reply" appeared in the February, 1924, "Christian East." Our next issue will contain Professor Glubokovsky's "reply," and the subsequent issue, if he thinks fit, will contain Mgr. Batiffol's final word and, in any case, a summary of the symposium by Mr. Hakluyt Egerton.

I HAVE been asked to comment upon Mgr. Batiffol's comments upon Professor Glubokovsky's reply to an article of Mgr. Batiffol, entitled *Catholiques anglicains et Catholiques romains*, which was itself a reply to a sermon of mine. I admit that I do so unwillingly. The points in controversy are so old. The interchange of controversial conclusions seems to go on for ever without any issue. It would seem as if something deeper than historical considerations really determines our respective convictions. Still there are some changes in the atmosphere of the discussion.

The historical French School, in which Duchesne's name is the most brilliant, but of which Mgr. Batiffol is the most distinguished living representative, has made a difference in the controversy by the large interpretation which it gives to the idea of development in the doctrine of the Church, an idea which involves peculiar difficulties of its own, but which enables those Roman Catholics who adhere to it to recognise that the doctrine of papal supremacy was not *developed* in the early centuries—that it was there only in germ; and on the other hand there is among some Protestant writers, and among us Anglicans, a fuller realisation that the development of the Papacy was for the West in some sense *providential*—however much the purpose of Providence has been, here as elsewhere, misused by its human instruments.

The position occupied by Heiler in Germany—a convert from Rome to Lutheranism—who yet writes to convince his fellow Protestants of the necessity of historical Catholicism and of the spiritual glory of the Roman Church—represents a somewhat new form of antagonism—antagonism which is quite consistent with an even deep appreciation. Learned Protestantism has never been so much and so sympathetically interested in Catholicism as it is to-day.

Nevertheless the old points of controversy cannot be got out of the way.[1]

[1] In these remarks I think it more respectful to Professor Glubokovsky and to Mgr. Batiffol not to interfere in their arguments with one another in detail. The Professor is replying as well as I.

NOTE BY EDITOR.—The *Christian East* has received a detailed article from Professor Glubokovsky who at present is resident in Bulgaria, which arrived too late for translation and insertion in this issue, but which will appear in its August number.

I.

We cannot get rid of the controversy on the ground of Scripture. Every one must admit that Rome has captured the imagination on behalf of its grandiose interpretation of "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church." A similar victory over the imagination was won by Luther in his interpretation of St. Paul, or to give a more recent example, by the Darwinian doctrine of Development in the form in which it professed to destroy the idea of the Fall of Man, and to substitute for it the idea of an inevitable upward progress from animalism to increasing rationality. But these victories over the imagination are not always permanent. They yield to disillusionment. That has been in the last case the most powerful solvent. But also criticism, where it is well grounded and persistent, tells in the long run. Thus, in spite of Luther, St. Paul is commonly regarded by the "critics" as the real founder of Catholicism. Thus also the rest of the New Testament, when carefully examined, and especially the Epistles of St. Paul and St. Peter, constitute formidable obstacle to the Papal interpretation of the Petrine text.

Nothing, it seems to me, can be more certain than that St. Paul recognised no spiritual authority on earth superior to that of the Apostles—to that authority of which he was so fully conscious in himself—and that he admits no real difference of dignity or of office between the Apostles. And if St. Peter wrote from Rome to the Pauline Churches of Asia, whether after St. Paul's death or no, is it not almost inconceivable that he should not have given some hint of the peculiar and paramount vocation of himself and his successors at Rome in the whole Catholic Church, if he had been conscious of it? Could he have been content to describe himself as "a fellow elder and witness of the sufferings of Christ"? Or does the doctrine of development admit of the supposition that St. Peter was unconscious of the meaning of Christ's "prophecy" of the papacy which only later history was to disclose?[1]

[1] Mgr. Batiffol makes a curious remark on the interpretation which, he believes, history gives to the Petrine text. "We will not," he says (p. 35) "build the institution of the monarchical episcopate on the texts of the New Testament which speak of the ἐπίσκοπος of the apostolic age, but the monarchical episcopate has its anticipation and justification in these texts. It is the same with the apostolic privilege claimed and exercised by the Popes. It is in accordance with the primacy of the Apostle Peter which is an anticipation of it and authorises it."

I think this is a really bad argument. I do not think any anticipation and authorisation of the monarchical episcopate can be found in the presbyter-bishops of the New Testament. If the monarchical episcopate is to find its authorisation there, it

II.

For we must challenge the Roman maintainers of the doctrine of development to explain themselves. Rome in its official documents ignores any real development. The constitution "*Pastor æternus*," issued by Pius IX., as the outcome of the Vatican Council and with its approbation, culminates in the tremendous definition that it is a dogma divinely revealed that the Roman pontiff when he speaks *ex cathedra* . . . is possessed of that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be provided for defining doctrine regarding faith or morals; and that therefore such definitions of the Roman pontiff are irreformable of themselves and not from the consent of the Church"; and it also declared that, in so defining, the Pope was "faithfully adhering to the tradition received from the beginning of the Christian Faith." Leo XIII. in the *Satis cognitum* writes wholly in this sense.[1] Cardinal Newman, when he was modifying his earlier idea of the development of doctrine in the Church, declared that it was a matter beyond doubt—which only needed stating *pro majori cautela*—"that all the doctrines of the Church were there from the time of the Apostles; that they were ever in their substance what they are now." You may say then that in the original tradition they were *implicit* and not *explicit*, but only in the sense that, though the Church was conscious of them in substance, they had not been brought out into a distinct or formulated shape.

It was in this sense that the first Christian Church believed implicitly in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, in virtue of its belief in the threefold Name of God—the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost—but had not formulated the doctrine. This is the idea of development held by Vincent of Lerins. It is the ancient idea. It is quite intelligible. It appears to be still the official Roman idea.

is because it would appear that the presbyter-bishops never were the highest order in the Church: but that over them from the first were either the apostolic founders of the churches, or apostolic rulers of a single church, like St. James at Jerusalem, or apostolic legates like Timothy and Titus, who appear to bridge the interval between the death of the apostles and the universal institution of monepiscopacy. On the other hand, I should contend that there is no evidence for, and indeed conclusive evidence against, the existence of any kind of authority or office (as distinct from honorary precedence) higher than belonged to each apostle, or to the apostolic college acting together. And there is no trace that the leadership of Peter, any more than the leadership of Paul, was meant to be perpetuated in his successors.

[1] The Vatican decree represents the *vetus et constans omnium sæculorum asserta fides*.

But to bring the modern Roman dogmas, and especially those concerning the papacy under this formula is a hopeless task. It is as plain as day that the East had no idea of a central authority divinely instituted; and that the General Councils expressed a quite different conception of the final seat of church authority. And St. Irenæus' celebrated phrase about the "superior pre-eminence" of the Roman Church, whatever the ambiguity of the Latin translation, at any rate grounds the special position of the Roman Church in the maintenance of the tradition on something wholly different to the Petrine privilege surviving in the Bishops of Rome. He grounds it on the central position of the metropolitan see which caused it to be visited by men from all quarters, so that it became what no other Church was, a despository not of a merely local tradition but of the tradition of all parts of the world. The dogma concerning the Pope expressed in *Pastor æternus* was the culmination of a real development which gained ascendancy in the West, largely by the help of false documents, but also by the urgency of human need, in which we must see a providential purpose. But the development of the institution was made to rest upon a doctrine which was indeed already fairly well developed in the Fifth Century in Rome and which thence forward found very little to contend against in the West; but which was unknown in the Apostolic tradition as Origen enumerates its elements, and as the great Greek Fathers knew it in the East,[1] or Irenæus and Tertullian in the West; and which is fundamentally inconsistent with Cyprian's theory and practice.

We do ask Mgr. Batiffol to explain more precisely what he means by the development of doctrine and what is involved in his setting aside of Vincent of Lerins' theory as inadequate.

III.

The doctrine of the supremacy of the Pope *jure divino* and (finally) of his infallibility was a Western development; and in rejecting it the Easterns were not rejecting anything which they had previously received. There are certain standing proofs of this proposition which cannot, we think, be overthrown.

As to infallibility such a standing proof is the condemnation of Pope Honorius as a Monothelite heretic by the Sixth and Seventh Œcumenical Councils.

This condemnation could not have been passed without elaborate explanations, if the idea of papal infallibility had in any way been reckoned as part of the faith. That would be admitted. For the

[1] For the Greek-speaking Church of the Fourth Century, as Duchesne said, "the Papacy, such as the West knew it later on, was still to be born."

doctrine of papal infallibility was not at that time developed even in the West.

But is the same proposition true as regards papal supremacy *jure divino?* Of this one crucial proof is the 28th canon of Chalcedon, taken together with the sixth canon of Nicæa and the third of Constantinople. These surely demonstrate that the primacy of Rome was, in the mind of the East, based upon the secular position of Rome and was a matter of ecclesiastical arrangement. It was on these grounds that it was proposed to give to Constantinople a position second to, but similar to, that of old Rome. And this was decreed by the Fourth Œcumenical Council following the Second. It is pleaded by Mgr. Batiffol, as by others, that the Fathers of Chalcedon made the canon subject to the assent of the Pope. So they did in words—"as a matter of pure ceremony," Duchesne says. For in spite of the vigorous protests of Leo and his successors, the canon took effect and was reaffirmed in the Quinisext Council *in Trullo*. But it might very naturally have been held by the Easterns with more sincerity that so important a change in the relative positions of great sees ought only to be made subject to the assent of that which was confessedly the first see. That however is not the point. The point is that the language in which the precedency of Rome is recognised is quite incompatible with the conception of a *jus divinum* inherent in the see. And we think that Mgr. Batiffol is quite unsuccessful in removing this impression.

And in what he says about the appeals of Eastern bishops to Rome he seems to me to ignore that when we first hear of an appeal to Rome as a part of the recognised practice in the West—that is at the Council of Sardica—it appears as something which the Church found it expedient to grant, not as something which the Roman Church possessed by divine right. Even if all that Mgr. Batiffol says about these appeals were admitted, it does not at all follow that they are based on any recognition of a *jus divinum*.

Nor do I think that the Monseigneur's use of the acceptance of the formula of Hormisdas by John of Constantinople is quite fair. John—a poor weak man—did accept it under severe Imperial pressure. But in accepting it he prefaced it with a statement which evacuated it of its Roman meaning. He somehow identified his own see with the Roman see, so as to admit of the position that he was accepting nothing as belonging to Hormisdas which he himself did not share. Moreover, numbers of Eastern bishops were admitted to the communion of Rome without signing anything except a statement of the orthodox faith.[1]

[1] See on this matter Father Puller's *Primitive Saints and the See of Rome*, pp. 399 ff. and 421 ff.

No doubt, hard-pressed individuals among the Easterns made from time to time concessions couched in language pleasing to Roman ears. But I do not think that anything can explain away the facts which make it certain that no *de jure divino* supremacy of Rome had ever been accepted in the East generally.

* * * *

These remarks on the Monsignor's paper are far from covering all the ground. But an Anglican has the consolation of feeling that we have two books which do cover the whole ground—laboriously and accurately—Fr. Puller's *Primitive Saints and the See of Rome* (Longman) and Denny's *Papalism* (Rivington). On these we may well be content to rest our case.

LA REUNION DES EGLISES EN ROUMANIE.

By the Archimandrite Jules Scriban of Bucharest.

JUSQU'A la grande guerre, toutes les Eglises ont vécu dans une "splendid isolation" qui n'était pas du tout splendide. Et non seulement dans les branches séparées du christianisme, mais au sein même de la même Eglise, comme notre Eglise Orthodoxe, l'absence de toute relation entre les filles d'une seule mère était à déplorer.

Néanmoins, à côté de toutes les mauvaises suites de la guerre, en voilà une bonne: *ceux qui marchaient dans les ténèbres ont vu une grande lumière* (Esaie 9, 1). Les Eglises, qui ne se souciaient plus d'être une forte collaboration vers la réalisation du Royaume de Dieu, ont senti l'appel des temps et ont commencé le mouvement vers la réintegration de ce christianisme trop éparpillé.

C'était une grande responsabilité qui pesait sur elles: celle de l'absence de l'harmonie et par conséquent de l'activité en commun pour évangéliser le monde. Elles ne pouvaient attendre autre chose qu'à toute ombre de prestige, si elles continuaient à vivre comme par le passé, c'est-à-dire comme des corps isolés ne voulant rien savoir l'une de l'autre. Leur indifférence vers leur rôle commun dans le monde était leur propre condamnation. Est-ce que Jésus n'avait pas dit: *Allez et instruisez toutes les nations!* Donc le problème du christianisme étant universel, n'était-il pas une attitude contraire à ce rôle que de ne pas vivre que d'une vie isolée et sans intérêt pour le christianisme d'ailleurs?

Il a été le grand mérite des Eglises d'Amérique d'avoir pris l'initiative pour la réintégration du christianisme, par les visites que les évêques de l'Eglise épiscopale des Etats-Unis ont faites en 1919 dans tous les pays chrétiens pour renouer des relations oubliées depuis longtemps. Le Mouvement de la *World Conference for Faith and Order* est un grand effort vers le rétablissement d'un état normal parmi les Eglises, car l'état actuel ne peut pas être ce qu'il devrait être au milieu d'un christianisme sentant un peu plus fortement sa responsabilité pour les âmes devenues sauvages. Aussi, il faut apprécier comme méritant tous les éloges la démarche de l'Eglise épiscopalienne d'Angleterre d'entrer dans des relations suivies avec l'Eglise Orthodoxe et d'avoir institué un comité, ayant à sa tête l'érudit et vénérable Evêque *Charles Gore*, expressément chargé de cultiver ces relations, pouvant ensuite arriver aux plus heureuses perspectives pour l'avenir des deux Eglises : Orthodoxe et Anglicane.

Je crois que les deux évêques anglicanes qui nous ont visités, Sa Sainteté Mons. *John Greig*, évêque de Gibraltar, au mois de novembre 1922, et Sa Sainteté l'Evêque *Charles Gore* l'année dernière au mois d'avril, ont pu se convaincre avec combien de plaisir l'Orient Orthodoxe voit se resserrer les liaisons avec les Eglises chrétiennes, en commençant avec la Grande et Puissante Eglise d'Angleterre qui vraiment est la première avec laquelle on puisse de notre part reconstituer le bloc du christianisme.

Peut-être qu'en Roumanie ils ont pu sentir tout cela moins qu'ailleurs. Toutefois nous autres, quelques théologiens de l'Eglise Orthodoxe de Roumanie, nous rendant compte de ce que nos relations avec l'Eglise Anglicane ont d'importance pour l'avenir du christianisme, nous faisons des efforts, tant par notre presse que par les revues ecclésiastiques, pour faire pénétrer cette idée dans la conscience publique, pour éveiller l'attention et rendre simpatique et intelligible l'idée des relations toujours plus suivies entre nos Eglises. C'est pourquoi il est bien possible qu'à l'avenir l'Eglise Orthodoxe Roumaine passe au premier plan pour mener à bonne fin les relations avec l'Eglise Anglicane, que nous attendons toujours plus vives et fréquentes.

Nous nous rendons compte de la responsabilité de l'Eglise de Roumanie. Elle est maintenant la plus nombreuse Eglise Orthodoxe, avec plus de 12,000,000 d'orthodoxes. Et loin de penser à avoir une sorte de primauté sur les autres Eglises Orthodoxes, elle doit pourtant prendre sur elle de porter le drapeau du christianisme au moment où notre sœur, la Grande Eglise de Russie, ne peut plus bouger. Non pour dominer, mais bien pour servir, nous voulons que notre Eglise prenne plus fortement dans ses mains les brides du christianisme dans cet Orient tellement bouleversé et malheureux. Donc c'est de notre part qu'on devrait répondre le plus vivement

aux efforts répétés de l'Eglise Anglicane pour nous reconstituer en un seul tronc chrétien.

C'est ce que nous tâchons de faire maintenant ici et c'est ce que je veux qu'on sache au sein de l'Eglise d'Angleterre, pour que ses grandes personalités et la Grande Figure de l'Archevêque de Canterbury apprennent que leurs vaillantes voix trouvent un grand retentissement chez nous et qu'ils n'attendront pas longtemps jusqu'à ce qu'ils entondront d'autres voix que la mienne. Mais la mienne aussi n'est pas trop tard.

THE WAR AGAINST RELIGION IN GEORGIA.

GEORGIA obtained her independence in 1917 and was recognised as a sovereign State by the Treaty of Versailles, being admitted to the League of Nations. Prince Soumbatoff, who is still resident in London, was received as her minister at the Court of St. James. In 1921, however, the Bolsheviks invaded the country and set up a Soviet Government of the Moscow pattern but with a Georgian personnel. In 1922 these were found insufficiently pliable and were largely replaced by Jews, and Russians. Soviet Georgia, though theoretically independent, is, like Soviet Armenia, a puppet State, not only tied by stringent treaties to the suzerainty of Moscow but in fact ruled from thence. The fate of the country since 1921 has been much the same as that experienced by Russia between 1917 and 1922. There has been a similar Red Terror with wholesale *battues* followed by an organised attempt to destroy the Orthodox Georgian Church, which, like that of Russia, retains the passionate love of the great majority of the nation. It would seem, indeed, as if *mutatis mutandis* the Moscow authorities were so well satisfied with the tragedy enacted in Russia that, famine and all, they had determined to reproduce its phases on the ancient and civilized people of the unhappy little State. A perusal of the appended extract from the Tiflis *Communist* will show anyone who has followed events in Russia the warranty for this observation.

Georgia, however, is almost a closed country to Europe, and it is probable that the trial of the Catholicos would have passed unnoticed in the West, and certain that it would have been followed by his murder and that of his fellow bishops and priests, if the *Times* had not commenced a vigorous campaign and the rest of the European Press, with the American, had not joined it—and also if the Moscow Soviet's recognition of Mr. MacDonald had not made it particularly anxious to placate British opinion.

In fact, and as a matter of course, the Catholicos and those with him were condemned in March, but the sentence was to seven years' imprisonment and not to death. That was a savage enough snarl. None the less, the Georgian Community in London and Paris received it as a son receives the mediço's diagnosis that his father's painful sickness has ceased to be dangerous. The Catholicos' appeal to the League which bulked so largely in his indictment, appeared in our May, 1923, number, under the title of the *Bitter Cry of the Georgian Catholicos*.

The silence of the League of Nations in the case of Georgia is paralleled by its impotence in the cases of Greece, Armenia and the Assyrians. That it will admit Soviet Russia to its membership without justice being done should be inconceivable, but appears probable.

The Communist (published in Tiflis), organ of the Soviet authorities, of February 1st, 1924 (No. 28) contained the following :—

"THE HOLY COUNTER-REVOLUTION."

(ACT OF ACCUSATION.)

"The Trial of Catholicos Ambrosius and His Council."

In the second half of February the trial of Catholicos Ambrosius (whose lay name is Besarion Khelaia) is to take place. Not only the Catholicos, but also the members of his Council—Kalistrate Tzintzadze, Joseph Mirianishvili, Marcoz Tkemaladze, Nicoloz Tavdgiridze, Archimandriti Djaparidze, Dimitri Lazarashvili, Joseph Capanadze, Nicoloz Ardjevanidze and Anton Totibadze are accused.

THE ACCUSATION.

The Appeal sent to the Conference of Genoa.

In February, 1922, the Catholicos and his Council drew up and forwarded an Appeal to the Genoa Conference. The object of this Appeal was to obtain armed intervention of foreign Powers in the internal affairs of the Georgian Republic. This Appeal contained the false counter-revolutionary statement that the foreign oppressors, the Russian invaders, approached the frontiers of Georgia and "on 25th February, 1921, when Georgia had shed her last blood in this uneven struggle, was obliged to submit to the heavy yoke of shameful slavery." It was also said in this Appeal that "they robbed the Georgian people and carried away its wealth."

The hiding of the treasures of the Sion and Mtzket Cathedral.

When in 1921 the Menshevik Government fled, the treasures of Sion and Mtzket Cathedrals, which were declared National property, were carried off to Kutais and buried beneath the balcony of the Bishop's house. The treasures were carried off and hidden by Archimandrite Djaparidze; in this he was aided by Lazarishvili, Kapanadze Tkemaladze and Tzintzadze. Catholicos Ambrosius and Metropolitan Nazarios are accused on the grounds of having known that the precious objects had been brought to Kutais and concealed and not having given information.

The obstruction shown to the Clerical Commission (Soviet) which had to take over the Military Cathedral.

The Catholicos Ambrosius, Tkemaladze, Tzintzadze, Tavdgiridze, Ardjevanidze and Totibadze refused on the 10th of January, 1923, to comply with the order to hand over the Military Cathedral, neither did they send their representatives to the Clerical Commission, which had to make the inventory of the objects of the Cult.

The concealment of precious objects of the Endubo Cathedral.

Joseph Marianashvili concealed in the Didube Cathedral 30 pounds of Church treasures and did not give them up to the Government Commission for the Relief of the Famine. These treasures were not entered in the inventory.

Moreover, a number of priests were accused of inaccurate accounts, as found by the inspection of the Clerical Commission. Joseph Capanadze is accused of having carried and delivered the Appeal of the Catholicos and his Council to the Genoa Conference.

Then follows the text of the Appeal by the Catholicos to the Genoa Conference, and it is stated that the preliminary investigation proved the text to be genuine and written in Catholicos' own handwriting.

RELATIONS BETWEEN THE ANGLICAN AND SOUTH-INDIAN "SYRIAN" CHURCHES.

By the Rev. W. S. Hunt, of the C.M.S.

THE people often called by Anglican writers the "Thomas Christians," and by themselves "Syrian Christians," who live in south-western India between latitude 9 and 11, number about a million souls, a quarter of the Christians of India, and are divided ecclesiastically into the following groups:—

1. Syro-Catholics (Romo-Syrians).
2. Orthodox Syrians (Jacobites).
3. Members of the Mar Thoma Church.
4. Syro-Chaldeans (Nestorians).

There are also those sometimes called "Syro-Anglicans."

The groups are placed in order according to their numerical strength, and are given their *official* designations with, in brackets, the names by which they are usually known. But, as mentioned above, all ordinarily call themselves, and are called by others, simply "Syrians"—occasionally "Nazrāni," their ancient name.

Groups 2 and 4 are, it will be noted, extensions of "separated" Eastern Churches, and No. 1, of the Roman Catholic Church, constituting a Uniat Church. No. 2 are not, of course, in communion

with the Orthodox Eastern Church, but are under the (Monophysite) Patriarch of Antioch. Their local head is their metrān (Metropolitan of Malabar) and their diocese the Diocese of Malankara. No. 3 are sometimes referred to as the Reformed Syrians, a name that they don't like. They are an autonomous Church, their ecclesiastical head is the Most Rev. Titus Mar Thoma, styled Metropolitan of the Mar Thoma Church of Malabar. The local head of Group No. 4 is the Most Rev. Mar Timotheus, Metropolitan of India, now in England*. No. 1 use a Syriac liturgy; No. 2 use the Syriac liturgy of St. James; No. 3 the same expurgated; No. 4 that of All the Apostles. Syriac is the liturgical language of all; but most sections now use their vernacular (Malayālam) very largely in their Services. All but No. 4 have bishops of their own race. Mar Timotheus is a native of Kurdistān. And among the Jacobite bishops are two or three natives of Syria.

All the "Syrians" are by race Indians, of the same stock as their Hindu neighbours.† All, except the Romo-Syrians, and possibly Syro-Chaldeans, intermarry, the bride joining her husband's Church. "Syrians" seldom marry non-Syrian Christians.

All believe that St. Thomas the Apostle came to their land and made many converts, of whom they are the descendants, ordained clergy, organised the Church, and was martyred near Madras in A.D. 65; and that in 345 another Thomas, a merchant, brought a large company of Christians from Persia and Mesopotamia, including a bishop and priests sent by the East Syrian Patriarch, who reinforced and revived their then languishing Church. This is not the place to discuss this tradition, or how it is (the first part of it) to be reconciled with the story in the *Acts of Thomas* of the Apostle's evangelisation of an "India" governed by a Parthian king who reigned in Cabul. But it has been thought that in the second part, that about the reinforcements, we may have history; that the South-Indian Church may have been the product of the missionary activity of the East Syrian (Assyrian) Church which regarded St. Thomas as its founder. If the date may be accepted (it is not by some), that was before the East Syrian Church identified itself with the cause of Nestorius.

Such meagre scraps of evidence as there are seem to show the Indian Church's dependence upon the East Syrian Church up to the sixteenth century. This, however, is contested by Groups 1,

*The Indian headquarters of Nos. 1, 2, and 3 are in the State of Travancore, of No. 4 in that of Cochin. There is a small diocese in British Malabar (that of Anyūr) in communion with No. 3.

†There are, however, certain families known as "Southists" who believe that their ancestors came from Mesopotamia in the fourth century and that their people have always intermarried, never married Indians. And there are others whose forbears, in more recent centuries, came with bishops sent by the Patriarch and who married Syro-Indians wives and settled in the land. Old-fashioned people like to consider themselves Syrian by race. The younger educated men and women, affected by the wave of nationalism, are often fervently Indian.

2 and 3. In the sixth century Cosmas Indicopleustes, an Alexandrian, touching at Ceylon, heard of Christians in South India receiving bishops from Persia, and the Christians themselves have, in one of their churches, an eighth-century monument with a Persian (Pehlavi) inscription. Marco Polo, the Venetian traveller, in the thirteenth century, described St. Thomas's shrine near Madras; the Apostle's body had long before been conveyed from "India" to Edessa, the East Syrian Church's earliest centre. Franciscan and Dominican fathers, in the following centuries, visited the shrine and found there, one of them says, "Nestorians, that is to say Christians, but vile and pestilent heretics." Another (Jordanus) says that, with his brethren, he "won over to the faith ten thousand schismatics and unbelievers," the former no doubt Thomas Christians.

Then came the Portuguese, early in the sixteenth century, and began to build up their Eastern Empire. The Christians welcomed them and they, after long striving, at the end of the century, compelled them to submit to Rome. All the Syriac manuscripts they could find they burnt, but the Christians were allowed to retain their old liturgy, purged of Nestorianism and Romanised. An Anglican, Michael Geddes, Chancellor of Sarum, who had been a chaplain attached to our embassy in Lisbon, wrote a history of these proceedings from Portuguese sources and it was published in London in 1694* by which time the Dutch had ousted the Portuguese from South-west India and turned all European ecclesiastics out of the country. Later, however, they suffered certain (non-Portuguese) Carmelites to enter. Those of the Christians who disliked Roman rule and Western ways sent appeals for help to the heads of the Eastern Churches, Nestorian, Jacobite and Coptic, which resulted in the coming of a bishop from Antioch. Through his influence a number of congregations became Jacobite, hardly aware probably of their Christological *volte-face*. The others remained loyal to Rome.

At the opening of the nineteenth century, when the States of Travancore and Cochin came under British protection and English people began to interest themselves in the Syrians, they were thus divided—into Romans and Jacobites, the former calling themselves the "old," and the latter being called by them the "new," party. Nestorians were, apparently, non-existent, though a Nestorian bishop had lived in Travancore from 1708 to 1730. (The present Syro-Chaldeans date only from the last decade of last century, up to which time they were Romo-Syrians.)

We now come to the relations between the Anglican Church and the Syrians. In 1725 the members of the Danish mission in Tranque-

*He enumerated fifteen "doctrines wherein the Church of Malabar agrees with the Church of England and differs from the Church of Rome." This refers to the Malabar Church before the coming of the Portuguese, of course.

bar tried to get into touch with the latter. It seems to have been at the instigation either of the S.P.G. or S.P.C.K. that this was done. Those societies, first the former and then the latter, helped to finance the Danish mission. In 1811 the S.P.C.K. asked the missionaries "whether it would not be possible to obtain workers from the Thomas Christians." The missionaries thought it would be inadvisable and reminded the society how their predecessors, in 1725, "by the advice of their friends in Europe," had "endeavoured to make acquaintance with the dignitaries and clergy of the St. Thomas, or Syrian, Christians . . . and to unite them with the Protestant Church, or at least to bring them to agree in doctrine with Protestants . . . but they were at last obliged to give up all hopes of such a union." The missionaries gave reasons for this and for not employing them as workers, e.g., because they adhered to doctrines that "militate against" several of the Thirty-nine Articles, "because they would demand of us to conform to *their* persuasion and ritual instead of conforming themselves to that of the Church of England," etc., etc. This reference to the Articles and to the Church of England suggests that the friends who had advised them to approach the Syrians had been Anglicans, presumably those with whom they corresponded, the Society that helped them.

It may have been a book published in 1811 that prompted the S.P.C.K.'s inquiry in that year, as it may have been Geddes' book that prompted that in 1725. The former was written by a chaplain in Bengal, the Rev. Claudius Buchanan, who had been down to Travancore in 1806 and had conferred with various leading Jacobites. Their metropolitan gave him a written statement to the effect that "a union with the Church of England, or at least such a connection as would appear to both Churches practicable and expedient, would be a happy event."* The Syrians were then in a depressed condition, after all the turmoil and fightings of the eighteenth century, but were respected by their Hindu neighbours. Their Church was described as "ignorant and formal and dead." No bishop, or communication, had come from Antioch for more than fifty years; indeed, Buchanan seemed to think that the link with Antioch was on the point of snapping and the Patriarchate itself on the verge of extinction, and the Syrians consequently "in a state to become what we choose to make them." Their Monophysism he believed to be merely nominal. In this he was confirmed by a more important person, the first Anglican bishop in India, Dr. Middleton, who paid three visits to Travancore for the express purpose of making "a minute and careful investigation of the Syrian Church." He wrote

*Another chaplain, the Rev. R. H. Kerr, of Madras, visited the Syrians just before Buchanan did. He felt that "to unite them to the Church of England would be a most noble work." Buchanan at first shared this view, but afterwards held "an official union" to be impracticable—for political reasons.

after his second visit, in 1816, (the second in that year; he was consecrated in 1814), "Whether they will ever be brought to symbolise exactly with the Church of England is very doubtful, but there can be no doubt that they are prepared for an intimate and friendly communion with us," and after his third visit, in 1821, "There is no visible approximation to the Church of England and . . . if ever there should be, it will be communicated to the bishop of that Church in India."

(*To be completed in next issue*).

THE ANGLO-CATHOLIC PILGRIMAGE TO JERUSALEM.

WE expect to be able to give an account of the Pilgrimage, which started from London on April 28, in our next issue. Meanwhile we print here the important addresses presented to the Patriarchs Photios and Damianos, to which reference has been made in the splendid reports which, by its enterprise, the *Church Times* has already published.

TO HIS BEATITUDE PHOTIOS, POPE AND PATRIARCH OF ALEXANDRIA, JUDGE OF THE ŒCUMENICAL COURT.

We, Roscoe Lord Bishop of Nassau, and Ernest Lord Bishop of Nebraska, by the Grace of God being Bishops of His Holy Church in England and being now on Pilgrimage with priests and faithful laity of the particular Holy Churches of England, Ireland and Scotland, to that Holy Land in which our Most Blessed Lord and Saviour assumed human flesh and, becoming man even as we, accomplished our salvation, and pausing on our journey to visit and to pray within this world-famous city of Alexandria wherein the ever-Blessed Evangelist and Martyr St. Mark set up his Apostolic Throne and from which throughout the vicissitudes of history and the tragedies of the ages as from a lighthouse the true and all-saving light of the Gospel has ever shone forth upon the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of Christ and upon all mankind, guiding them in the way of life and a lantern pointing them on the path of that Right and Orthodox Faith which was once and for all delivered to the Saints, seize the occasion to address ourselves to your Holiness, the successor of the Blessed Evangelist, of the most Holy Athanasios, the most wise Cyril, and of that long list of martyrs, confessors, doctors and saintly Patriarchs who have occupied the renowned throne of the Pope and Patriarch, and to assure you of the good will and staunch affection which is felt for your Holiness alike by ourselves and by our brethren in Great Britain.

Whatever schisms have been made in the seamless robe of Christ, we would ask your Holiness to believe that the particular autokephalous Churches of our land and nation have never been wilfully separated from the Holy Orthodox Church of the East. Rather we would say that in the workings of history and through the great distances of space our forefathers were hardly aware of the needs and lives of their Eastern brethren. They knew of the valiant and noble martyrdom which the Greek race was suffering for the Cross and Name of our Lord Christ at the cruel hands of the Turks, but the world in which they lived was far from the theatre of warfare. Whenever, however, they came in touch with the Holy Church of the East they were won to the greatest admiration not only for its witness to the Cross but also for its constancy to the Faith of the Seven Holy Œcumenical Councils, and to gratitude for the zeal with which it has been inspired by God to preserve that Faith without change, addition or diminution.

Thus we remember with pride and satisfaction that as far back as the early 19th century your Holiness' predecessor, Kritopoulos Metrophanes, was an honoured friend of the then Archbishop of Canterbury and a welcome visitor to our land when he came as a student to reside at our University at Oxford, nor can we forget that the Codex Alexandrinus, which is among the most treasured and sacred documents of our race, was a gift of brotherly love from the city which was made a fountain of Biblical exposition by the great Pantænos.

In our own days the lessening of distance, the labours of many lovers of Christ, both Orthodox and Anglican, and, above all, the comradeship in suffering for the right, in labour for liberty and progress and in the long struggle of the Great War have brought the Orthodox nations of the East into closer touch with the British Churches and have taught us to know each other. That near acquaintance has added fuel to the eager zeal of those of each communion who have consecrated themselves to further the realisation of the prayer of the Great High Priest for the full unity in the life of His Spirit, of His Holy Body, the One Church.

That your Holiness shares our ardent longing for that end we are well assured. That it may be accomplished in our own day may be more than we are right to hope, but that in God's providence and time it will be accomplished by the prayer, the labour and the love of men of goodwill we cannot doubt without sinning against the Holy Spirit. We therefore ask your Holiness to pray for God's blessing on those theologians of both Churches who by incessant toil are endeavouring to establish that full and complete dogmatic agreement between the Anglican and Eastern Churches without which Intercommunion is impossible. As an earnest of our mind we venture to place in your hands a copy of a Declaration of Faith signed by our famous theologian and Bishop, Dr. Gore, 3,000 Anglican bishops and priests, as an exposition of what they hold to be the official teaching of the Anglican Church. It is true that among us there are other voices, but we believe that this document represents the historic witness of our Communion both for the past and for the present.

We venture also, as an evidence of the most Christian and kind advance made to us on the part of the Orthodox hierarchs, to hand your Holiness a recent personal declaration as to Anglican Ordinations made by that wise and learned theologian and champion of Orthodoxy, Anthony, the Most Reverend Metropolitan of Kiev and President of the Russian Synod at Karlowitz, after his study of the question in collaboration with the eminent lay theologian Professor Glubokowsky.

And, in conclusion, in thanking your Holiness for this most kind reception which you have vouchsafed to us, we ask you to pray, that guided by God we may further worship at the most sacred shrines of our Holy Religion, and drawing fresh spiritual life from our pilgrimage thereto, may return to our own country in peace and salvation of soul and body, washed, cheered, and refreshed, there to labour for the preparation of this world to be the Kingdom of Christ, and in all things to hear and to do His Blessed Will, and to rejoice in the comfort of His Spirit, and in our fellowship with His Saints here in this world and in His Glorious Paradise hereafter.

And so we pray Him, to hearken to the humble prayers which we put to the Intercessions of the most Holy Mother of God and of all the Saints, to hold your Holiness, your flock, the whole Orthodox Church and all Christians in His keeping until the day of His appearing.

TO HIS BEATITUDE DAMIANOS, THE LORD PATRIARCH OF THE HOLY CITY JERUSALEM AND OF THE PROMISED LAND.

We, Roscoe Lord Bishop of Nassau, and Ernest Lord Bishop of Nebraska, together with priests and faithful laity of His Holy Church in communion with His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, who have been blessed by Almighty God to visit as humble but devout pilgrims, the most Holy and Adorable Places where the Word, the Eternal Son, having taken flesh of His Blessed Mother by the operation of the Holy Spirit, the Lord and Giver of Life, was born, was crucified, died, was buried and

rose again for our salvation and for that of all mankind, rejoice to express to Your Beatitude the great respect, affection, goodwill and gratitude which are felt, as by ourselves, so throughout not only the particular Churches of Great Britain and Ireland, but also all the branches of the Anglican Communion overseas towards the Holy Church of Zion, the ancient and worthy Confraternity of the Holy Sepulchre and to your Beatitude, the successor of the Holy Apostle James, the Brother of our Blessed Lord, as the Patriarch of Jerusalem, the Mother of all Churches and the President of that Confraternity.

In the age of the Seven Persecutions of the Cross, as if to safeguard them from desecration at the heathen hand of Old Rome, the Divine Providence suffered the Holy Places not only to be covered with a veil of earth but even to be profaned by the setting up upon them of the images of Pagan Gods.

But after that the Triumph of the Labarum at the Milvian Bridge had given peace to the Church and the Heathendom of Rome had become Christendom, then, while the noble Christ-loving Emperor Constantine, whom we, with you, reverence as Isapostolic, busied himself with the calling of the First Œcumenical Council, with the building of the New Rome and with the first founding of that Great Church of St. Sophia, which we mourn to know is still in bondage, his Holy Mother Helena, who, like her son, is therefore to be accounted Isapostolic, hastened to this Holy City, the Mother of all the Churches, and in order that the Crown might be set upon the Conversion of the Œcumenical World to the Gospel, sought diligently to find the Holy Places of the Passion of our Lord.

Her faith was rewarded, and when the earth had been removed from the spot made known to her by a vision, there were revealed not only the Most Holy Cave of the Sepulchre, Gethsemane and awful Golgotha but also the True Cross and the other Instruments of the Crucifixion.

The companion in the search of the Isapostolic Empress was your Beatitude's predecessor, Makarios, of most blessed memory, and when at her son's entreaty she resolved to raise a Temple to enshrine those most sacred places, it was to him that she and her son entrusted the building of the world-famous Church of the Anastasis and the Presidency of the Confraternity which they established as its lawful guardian. Throughout the ages that most weighty and holy trust has been exercised by your predecessors, the successors of St. Makarios, with the greatest fidelity. Never has it been used for selfish ends, but always as for the Christian world. Thus you and your predecessors have never failed to extend warm Christian hospitality to pilgrims from the West and to others who were not of the Orthodox Church. Your door has been closed to none, even though they reviled you.

Further, we Anglicans recognise that the faithfulness of your Confraternity to its great trust, its devoted and loving care of the glorious shrines which it has raised upon the Holy Places and the unfailing and generous charity with which it receives and has ever received all pilgrims who desire to worship within them has justified and vindicated its world-approved right to be the guardian of Mount Calvary and of the Cave of Bethlehem.

As, therefore, we move from point to point and find healing and refreshment for our souls and bodies from the virtue of the Holy Places, we shall render thanks to the Giver of all good things for the existence of your Confraternity and shall pray for its continued well-being and protection from every aggression.

And, further, we would express to your Beatitude the thankfulness and admiration with which we who dwell in the safe Home of Christian Liberty are inspired by the Faith and Witness of the Church of Zion, under bitter oppression and infidel tyranny, to the Faith of the Gospel.

It is with the sympathy of brothers that we glory in and are encouraged by the fact that neither persecution nor temptation to purchase earthly security at the price of the betrayal of the Truth have been strong enough to win the Orthodox Church to apostasise by compromise upon the Catholic Faith as she believes it to have been

delivered by the Christ to His Apostles, to have been enshrined in Sacred Scripture and the Writings of the Fathers, to have been defined by those Pillars of the Truth, the Seven Œcumenical Councils, and to have been passed down to her in the Living Tradition of the Saints. With that Faith, as we understand it, and, as for example, we read its exposition in the Confession of the Patriarch Dositheos and the Acts of the Synod of Bethlehem, we are in substantial agreement and we look forward in confident hope to the speedy coming of that happy day when the Theologians and Hierarchs of our respective Communions shall have reached that complete and full doctrinal accord which is the necessary condition of our Reunion.

We realize with thanksgiving to the One God and Father of us all that the fruition of that great dream has been largely hastened by the decision of your Holiness surrounded by the Synod of this famous Patriarchate and in company with the Œcumenical Patriarchate and the Church of Cyprus, to acknowledge the validity of Anglican Ordinations as on a parity with those of Rome and of other Churches which you receive as possessing the requisite marks of Apostolic Succession.

Finally we desire to tender to your Beatitude our heartfelt congratulation on the celebration of your Jubilee last year, and to express our deep sense of the services which in your long Ministry you have rendered not only to the Church of Zion and to the Orthodox Churches but also to the cause of Christianity.

That the good God in His loving kindness may grant you yet further years of beneficent rule over your people is our sincere prayer and will be echoed by our fellow Anglicans and all Christians.

We ask you to pray for our safe return to our homes, and that, enriched by the blessings showered upon us in this pilgrimage to the Holy Land, we may be fruitful in good works for the Faith and People of the Church of our Lord.

AMERICAN LETTER.

WITH more than three millions of people in America from Eastern Orthodox countries, their relation to the Episcopal Church is a more acute problem than it is in any other sphere of the Anglican Communion. Archbishop Theodore and the Crusades gave contact, and since the Reformation there have been many devout students labouring with great patience to establish a common meeting ground.

The American Church in the middle of the last century sent Bishop Southgate as a missionary to the Near East. A school was founded in Athens, but after a careful survey and spending some time in residence in Constantinople, he returned home. He reported that he found a church fully organised with its own bishops occupying the field and he would not be a party to setting up a schism. He therefore resigned and became Rector of the Church of the Advent, Boston. Many American bishops have studied carefully the Eastern Church and visited practically every portion of the field. The late Bishop Hale of Cairo, Illinois, made it his life study. The late Bishop Grafton of Fond du Lac was in constant communication with the authorities, and his visit to Russia in 1903 seemed to open the door for more definite negotiations. The year after his death the General Convention in 1913, sitting in New York, appointed a joint Commission to confer with the authorities of the Eastern Orthodox

and Old Catholic Churches. In America the latter Church, with one Bishop and two Bishops-elect, has had a checkered career that would make a separate story.

The Orthodox Church began in America with its mission to the Aleutian Islands and Alaska before that territory was purchased by the United States. The Bishop of Alaska and Aleut later transferred his residence to San Francisco. Then, with the immigration of large numbers of Slavic peoples and other members of the Orthodox Church from the Near East to Eastern America, the Episcopal seat was moved to New York.

Patriarch Tikhon was its first incumbent. It was he who moved the Cathedral from San Francisco to New York City. He was succeeded by Archbishop Platon, who later returned to Russia and became Metropolitan of Odessa until the Bolshevik upheaval, when he returned to New York and is again occupying the Cathedral.

By right of precedence the Russian Church would seem to have the responsibility of leadership, and did so until the War. But with her income lost, her property threatened, and many of her people seeking employment as Poles, in order to avoid the implications of Bolshevism if admitting that they were Russian, the lot of the Russian Church in America is a most difficult one. Associated with the Russian Archbishop is the Syrian Bishop, who has a large flock to whom he ministers. There is also the Bishop in charge of the Uniat Congregations in America; they are composed of a large group that was supposed to be under the Roman Church. But Rome was either unable or unwilling to fulfil her European Agreements. The Bishop therefore withdrew from Roman affiliation and joined the Russian Church and the clergy and the people have very largely followed his example, or sought admission to the Episcopal Church.

The Greek Church now has more than half a million adherents in America, and there are one hundred and seventy organised congregations with many smaller groups largely unshepherded.

During the war the Metropolitan of Athens came to America and arranged for the ministrations of many Priests and the appointment of a Bishop. At that time all the Greeks outside the homeland, with the exception of Trieste and Venice, were under the Governing Synod of Athens. After the war and the election of Archbishop Meletios as Patriarch Meletios IV., the missionary care of Greeks in foreign lands was assumed by the Holy Governing Synod of Constantinople. Alexander Rodostolou was then appointed Archbishop of North and South America in charge of all Greeks directly under the Patriarch of Constantinople. His position now seems to be one of pre-eminence amongst the Orthodox in America, and two Suffragan Bishops have been provided for him, one in Chicago and the other in Boston.

But changes come rapidly in America and we seem to reflect

the conditions in each country from which our people come. The living Church of Russia, supported by the Bolshevik government, has sent a mission to America and by a legal process has tied up all the property of the Orthodox Russian Church. For the second time Greek Royalists have sent to America a Bishop to represent their cause and another schism seems imminent that may represent one-sixth of the Greek population.

At a recent meeting of the Commission the following resolutions were adopted by a unanimous vote :—

RESOLVED, that we express our sympathy to the Patriarch of Moscow, Tikhon, and our hope that the Russian Church in America may remain true to the traditions for which the Patriarch has suffered.

RESOLVED, that this meeting send fraternal greetings to Archbishop Platon and Archbishop Alexander, assuring them of our affectionate interest and sympathy in the many perplexities that confront them in their work, and we pledge to them our cordial co-operation, and commend them to the support of our people.

During the past ten years the Commission of the Episcopal Church has been in frequent conferences with one or another of the Eastern Orthodox groups and its members have made a number of visits to the Near East. During the summer of 1920 its chairman, the Bishop of Harrisburg, with other members of the Commission, visited Constantinople. After a number of conferences with the Holy Governing Synod the following Concordat was solemnly agreed to as a working hypothesis in our missionary fields and as a step toward unity and permanent intercommunion. The Concordat was approved by the House of Bishops sitting in General Convention at Portland, Oregon, in October, 1922.

Terms of Agreement between Eastern Orthodox, Old Catholic, and Anglican Churches, proposed as basis of Restoration of Corporate Unity and Intercommunion.

In general, we accept with common mind the traditional and ecumenically received Faith, Ministry, and Sacramental Order of the historic Catholic Church ; acknowledging, however, that, subject to the requirement that these vital things should be carefully preserved and administered without alteration or compromise, each particular autonomous part of the Catholic Church has authority to regulate its own internal government, ritual, and spiritual discipline in adjustment to its peculiar racial, national, and modern conditions and circumstances. In particular :—

(*a*) We accept the authority of the Catholic Church over all the faithful to teach what is necessary to be believed and practised for salvation, and to enforce by spiritual means such holy discipline as may be required for the protection of the Church's Faith and Order, and for the guidance of souls in the way of eternal life.

(*b*) We accept the canonical Scriptures as being the veritable Word of God as given for the upbuilding of believers in the faith which they have received from Christ through His Church, and as confirming and illustrating all doctrine and practice which is generally necessary to be believed and fulfilled for salvation. In controversies as to the meaning of Holy Scripture we accept the Catholic Faith as affording a true summary of the fundamental and divinely inspired teaching which is progressively unfolded in the successive parts of the Bible.

(*c*) We accept the Nicene Creed, the decrees of Faith put forth by ecumenically accepted General Councils, and the Sacraments as means of grace.

Questions having arisen in connection with these matters, we agree to accept the mutual explanations as sufficient, until such time as the questions referred to can be determined by a truly œcumencial Council.

Impelled by consideration of the Saviour's prayer for the visible unity of all those who should believe in Him, by recognition of the present work of the Holy Spirit in many lands for the fulfilment of this prayer, and by realisation that the saving and sanctifying mission of the Church must be seriously hampered so long as its shameful divisions continue, we have agreed to the statements and the explanations given as affording a reasonable and sound basis of mutual recognition and intercommunion, and one which involves no surrender or compromise of the things given us by the Lord to preserve and administer for the benefit of souls.

In accordance with the preceding agreements we do solemnly declare our acceptance of the sacramental acts each of the other and that they are true and valid, and, holding fast the truth once delivered to the Saints, we pronounce that intercommunion is desirable and authorised for all our members wherever and whenever it is deemed convenient and practicable by the proper local ecclesiastical authorities.

These agreements were signed by :

(1) Bishop Herzog at a meeting of the Council of his Church in Berne, as representing the Swiss Old Catholics.

(2) In the Russian Church at Athens by Metropolitan Platon, Russian Archbishop of Kherson and Odessa.

(3) After a two days' discussion by Metropolitan Meletios and the Holy Synod of Greece with our Commission, a special committee of three, appointed for the purpose, reported in writing that the Concordat and Agreements were " very satisfactory."

(4) A week later, Archbishop Dorotheos, acting Patriarch of Constantinople, and the Holy Synod, after a two days' meeting passed

unanimously a formal resolution stating, " Therefore we beg to state by decision of the Holy Synod, we accept the said proposal with willingness and readily concede to it," and affixed the great seal of the Patriarchate to their statement, with an authorised translation from the Greek into English.

(5) On the same day the Armenian Patriarch of Turkey, the Most Rev. Zaveen, and the Very Rev. Kazazian, Vicar of the Patriarch of Jerusalem, who was on a visit to Constantinople, both signed the Agreements and Concordat in the presence of each other.

(6) Services of Thanksgiving and Rejoicing were held in the Greek Cathedral in Athens; the Russian Church in the same city; in the Armenian Cathedral in Constantinople; and in St. George's in Phanaar, the Church of the Œcumenical Patriarch.

(7) The newly elected Metropolitan of Rumania in the Archiepiscopal Palace at Bucharest, wrote as follows: " I foresee with pleasure that we shall be able to work together on the basis of those principles that are common to all Christianity, in order to contribute to the universal brotherhood through Evangelical Love," and held a service of friendly congratulation in his archiepiscopal chapel.

J.C.

ATHENS LETTER.

THE Church of Hellas is now getting into its stride under the new conditions of government, with its new and " real " synod at work on the measures that are before it. Generally, the opinion is that, though the new body has no doubt plenty of problems before it, and will have many a difficulty to face, yet it is a distinct improvement on what was the rule in old days.

One need not take too seriously the declarations that the old " permanent synod " was an unauthorised importation from " Protestant " sources. If it was derived from anywhere, it would seem to be from the very similar " synod " at Constantinople, which was evolved as the readiest way of governing the Church without arousing Ottoman suspicions. Nor is an accusation of the crime of being " unprimitive and uncanonical " a very serious one.

Men who know history know that no Church, whether its centre be at Rome, Canterbury, or Constantinople, administers itself in primitive style, and that the only question in such a case must be, " does the system work well? " As a matter of fact, the old " permanent synod " did not work well. It was too much afraid of rousing prejudice, to venture on even the most necessary practical

reforms, and far too liable to be under the political influences of the hour. In a country where " the spoils to the victors " is an understood principle of politics, it was very easy to remove several bishops from the little administrative synod, and send them back to their dioceses, while others of the " right political " complexion were substituted.

Now the Church is allowed a synod in which all bishops sit as of right, and from which any member of the body can only be excluded for definite reasons and after fair trial. This is the instrument for the self-government of the Church, under the supervision of the State. It is true that a royal commissioner (epitropos) sits in the body, as in the General Assembly of the Kirk at Edinburgh, though it may be that by the time these lines appear in print, the epithet " royal " will have ceased to apply in Greece! If, however, this functionary does not appear for any reason, the business of the synod proceeds notwithstanding, which was not the case of old. In fact, one of the readiest ways of preventing the synod from proceeding on any contentious business was to procure a diplomatic indisposition in the Commissioner!

A long list of matters, on which practical reform is a necessity, has been presented to the synod, and the first of these has now been cleared satisfactorily out of the way. The " Western Calendar " has been formally adopted and is now in force. It may perhaps be worth noting that this change has been adopted, in the " ultra-conservative and superstition-ridden East," with a conspicuous absence of all the trouble that attended it, in practical and common-sense England. We have had no riots here, with rioters demanding " give us back our eleven days! We are not going to die eleven days sooner to please the Pope! " Eastern and Western Christmas will in future fall on the same day, though we presume that the Armenian Church will continue its peculiar practice of observing only " the feast of the Manifestation " on January 6th. One result of this will be that, in the year of grace 1924, we in Greece are likely to have two Christmases, one having been observed on January 7th by the State Calendar, and another, we hope, on December 25th, by the Calendar both of Church and State!

Some day, perhaps, Easter may be kept by all Churches on the same day also, but that has not been achieved as yet. There are so many pitfalls in the calculation of the Great Feast! Is it not recorded how, even in the fifth century, a worthy monk left Alexandria as soon as Easter was over, and the fast done, and arrived at Rome to find that, by some confusion in the calculation, they were still in the middle of their Lent there!

For reasons that we confess to be beyond us, Orthodox Easter falls this year on April 27th, a week later than ours, and incidentall

on one of the days on which, according to our rule, " Easter cannot possibly fall " ! Apparently nothing but the agreement of all authorities on some fixed and arbitrary Easter can avoid these confusions, and for that a meeting will be a necessity. Possibly if such high potentates as the Pope, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Œcumenical Patriarch, were to meet at some neutral watering-place (we suggest Monte Carlo, as being outside the spiritual influence of all three !) they would find no difficulty in coming to a working understanding !

Other matters that are now before the synod include the drawing up of regulations for regular preaching, by both monks and parish priests. This duty, with its concomitant of proper religious instruction for the laity, has admittedly been neglected in the past, though there have been brilliant personal exceptions to that rule. Among these we may mention the priest Markopoulos, commemorated elsewhere in this magazine, whose early death is a heavy loss to the spiritual life of Athens.

The education of the people implies the education of the clergy, and this is another care of the synod. The question of the organisation of a higher Theological College, in addition to the one at Rhizarion, in Athens, is now being considered, and as the Metropolitan Chrysostom was himself head of the Rhizarion School before consecration, he approaches the matter with full personal experience.

One political question had to be faced—the matter of the anathema on Venizelos. This was pronounced, as readers may remember, with full pomp and ceremony at the time of the exile of that statesman during the war. It was an impropriety past question, for the man was not even accused of being a heretic, or conspicuous evil-liver, and it was an undisguised attempt to use religion as a political lever. English people in Athens at the time were at a loss whether to be more indignant at the fact, or interested in the primitive—not to say neolithic—character of the rite, and they were not in the least appeased by the explanation proffered by the then Metropolitan, " the soldiers told me that they would burn the Cathedral if I did not pronounce it." Some even spoke of a great artistic opportunity being missed, as well as a great moral one ! Now, however, the anathema has been regularly declared " void and therefore non-existent." This has avoided the rather awkward question of any removal of it.

A problem for the future in Greece is, how can the monasteries in the country be best fitted into the scheme of a modern Church. It may surprise an English reader to be told that the number of monasteries in this small country is 156, even if we leave out Mount Athos, with its twenty large and hundreds of small foundations. The number of monks is not very great, but one house alone—Megas-

pelæon—has 100 monks, and the average is about ten. Here again, we leave Athos out of the reckoning. The problem, how to fit conservative foundations like these into a self-reforming Church is a difficult one. We know how disastrously we cut the knot in our time! Let us wish the Greeks better counsel in their efforts to untie it!

Dissent is, in Greece, almost a negligible factor, but there is a small "Greek Protestant" body in Athens, and some of its leaders have a high social position. There is also the Roman body, both Latin and Uniat. The relations of the Orthodox with these "heterodox" Churches is one that is supervised by the State, which is as well; one would not like to trust Greek ecclesiastics with power to persecute, for they feel too keenly about such matters.

The problem of episcopal elections in the future is a thorny subject, and one that may perhaps cause difficulty. Hitherto, Bishops have been practically nominated by the State, though the "permanent synod" has a right of suggestions. In future, the Episcopal Synod is to be nearly a co-optative body, for, in a vacancy, it will suggest three names to the State (electing those three names freely), and the choice will be made from among them. There is a possibility of difficulty here, for one cannot help thinking that if the Episcopate in England had been co-optative, say in the sixties and seventies of the last century, some strange results might have followed! It is, however, easier to see dangers than to suggest a better course, for election by the laity of the diocese (though plainly primitive) is not likely to work well in Greece, where the dirty trail of politics is so apt to spread itself over all things! Here, as elsewhere, there is no absolute rule, and no method free from its dangers. "Whate'er is best administered is best."

Church courts are another question, and here a merely temporary solution has been adopted The old Perpetual Synod could depose bishops at will, and sometimes did so for purely political reasons. In future, cases are to be tried, either by a committee of the Synod, or by the whole synod acting as such. It is admitted that further regulation is needed here, and that one of the needs is a regular code of canons. Those of the Orthodox Church are not, perhaps, quite in so anarchic and confused a condition as are our own, but they are quite enough confused to make a new edition a necessity, and this is now in the capable hands of Dr. Alivazato, Procurator to the Synod.

Altogether, the spectacle of a national Church undertaking the work of canonical self-reform is one to which no Anglican will refuse his full sympathy, and the Church of England—whose members, as admittedly foreign guests in Greece, are not included in the "heterodox" Churches referred to above—may join with the Churches of

Antioch, Jerusalem and Rumania, in sending their congratulations and good wishes to the Hellenic Church in their important work.

YOUR CORRESPONDENT.

OUR BOOKSHELF.

THE POPE'S ENCYCLICAL ON THE SLAV UNIATES—A BIG STICK.

Encyclical Letter of Pius XI. on the occasion of the Third Centenary of St. Josaphat, Martyr, Archbishop of Polotsk. Burns & Oates. 1924.

We confess to having hoped much from this unhappy document, but to having hoped unreasonably. We looked for a word of kindness to the suffering Russian Church. We did not despair even of finding in it a word of appreciation of its witness for Christ against its atheist persecutors. On the contrary, we found in it nothing but a sharp and peremptory reassertion of the Papal Claims and an instigation to the proselytiser to reap the maximum from whatever opportunity the attack of the Soviet Government upon Orthodox Russia may have opened to the Uniate.

As we have said, our expectation was unreasonable, for the very title of this Encyclical should have warned us that even though it were styled an eirenikon it must be a pronouncement of the nature of the "big stick." There are two sides to most questions, and all that the Pope says of the personal holiness and devotion of Archbishop Josaphat may be quite true. But to the mind of the Orthodox, he stands for the initiation of that sixteenth-century campaign for the uniatisation of the Slav Church which relied largely on the remorseless aid of the secular power of the Polish Roman Catholic Kingdom and which was comparable to that which is now enterprised under the leadership of the Uniate Archbishop Shepitsky in collaboration with the revived Polish State, and which is reputed to be directed by Père M. d'Herbigny, the Director of the *Instituto Pontificale Orientale* of Rome.

As such Archbishop Josaphat stands to the Russian mind as the negation of the "supra-nationalism" which should be the mark of the Church and as an apostate persecutor of his nation and its historic Church. The issue of this Encyclical has therefore been received by the Orthodox, not as a call to Reunion, but as a redeclaration of war *à l'outrance* and as the prelude to an intensification of the campaign against the Russian Church which—*vide* the statements of Mgr. Cieplak and his Latin Polish colleagues recorded by Capt. McCullagh in his last book—the Bolshevik Terror invited the Papal missionary to begin in 1917.

Examine this Encyclical how we may, we can form no other conclusion of its tenor. As to how the Russian views it we may form an estimate from the wide circulation of the subjoined letter, brought by the Russian Orthodox Press from the limbo in which we would fain that the whole history of Archbishop Josaphat might rest, which was addressed to Archbishop Josaphat by Leo Sapega, the Lithuanian Chancellor of his day, and bears date March 12th, 1622, *i.e.*, a few months only before he was killed (November 12th, 1623) by the Russians of Viterbsk, whom he was engaged in converting forcibly to Papalism, and runs :—

Most Reverend Archbishop,

I was reluctant to enter into controversy with your Grace, but seeing how obstinately you maintain your opinion and that no refutation can move you from it, I now find myself forced against my will to answer your ill-judged letter. It is true that I myself gave close attention to the Unia, and to abandon it would not have been reasonable, but it never entered my head that your Grace would decide to bring people

into it by such forceful means.[1] The Most High invites all to come to Him gently. To drag slaves to Him He neither permits nor accepts. Moreover, by this senseless use of violence you have embittered the Russian subjects of our King and have turned them into rebels against him. It is difficult for you to deny this, for there are written complaints forwarded to the Polish officials and to the Grand Duke of Lithuania.

Are you really unaware of the discontent of the people and of their declaration that they would sooner go under bondage to the Turk than be persecuted for their Faith and Worship in the cause of the Pope?

You sneer arrogantly at us that we politicians trouble ourselves about the fate of these people. I may tell you then that not only do we politicians care about them, but the State itself cares about them, for it gains more from their willing obedience than from your forced Uniatisation.

Therefore you must limit your use of physical force in what you conceive to be your duty as a bishop to what is conformable to the King's law and the mind of the State, seeing that your present abuse of it is contrary to the public peace and the common weal, and borders on high treason. If you attempted to act thus high-handedly in Rome or in Venice, you would soon be taught to show respect to the common law of the State.

You write to me of your zeal for the Faith and of your will to bring the heretic to Reunion.

Indeed, it is most right that you should care greatly for their conversion and should strive that there should be One Fold and One Shepherd; but you should act with common sense and with an appeal to the heart—a method which is particularly needful in our own country.

Terrorism will not serve!

For success our zeal and efforts must be actuated by the Law of Love, as St. Paul puts it. And it is evident how much violence has caused you to fail and has stirred up the very people whom you might have won over to hate you and that for which you labour.

You say that you must follow the Holy Bishops in suppressing heresy. Assuredly it is right to follow Bishops such as Chrysostom, but you should follow them in kindness, in long suffering, in holiness and in good example. Read the lives of the Bishops and of Chrysostom. You will find in them no mention of dragging before courts, of bans, of scourgings, of torture, of persecution, of the depriving well-meaning men of life and so forth. You will find only that which promotes the Glory of God, which edifies mankind and which knits men together in love.

Contrast that with what your Grace is doing. The tribunals, the town halls, the courts of capital offence, the prisons are full of victims whose only offence is that they err in their religion.

You contend that you desire to destroy those who oppose the Unia.

You are ready even to cut off their heads. You should not act so towards them. The Lord has said, *Vengeance is mine. I will repay.*

Read the Writings of the Church.

How many disciples of the Christ have suffered torture and martyrdom?

Where in Holy Scripture can you find a denunciation of Nero or of Diocletian?—

[1] Till now there are preserved in the Polotsk Museum the instruments of torture used by Archbishop Josaphat upon the Orthodox who refused to deny their Faith, *e.g.*, (1) iron gloves, (2) leather thongs, (3) iron fetters. Russians who adhered to Orthodoxy were condemned to 15 strokes by order of Archbishop Josaphat Kuntsevich. They were struck on the cheek with the iron gloves and thrown into prison bound with the iron fetters. The immediate cause of the revolt of the people of Viterbsk was the doing to death in that fashion of an Orthodox priest at the command of the Archbishop. On the spot where this martyrdom took place a Church was built and dedicated to St. Elijah—the tercentenary being kept this year. See Ivan Dolgov's *Man of Polotsk*.

the sole expression is of rejoicing that the disciples are found worthy to suffer for the Name of Christ.

You write further that criticisms are heard in the Diet not only of the Unia but of the Papal hierarchy of the Latin kind.

Who has caused them? Yourself, when you close the people's churches, force them to die without the comfort of religion and persecute them bitterly.

In this you deny the King's justice of toleration and abuse his name. Thus you bring upon the State the charge of oppressing the consciences of its innocent subjects.

Further, you continue to maintain that those who reject the Unia should be driven from their homes and banished the land. May such an outrage never be perpetrated!

The Holy Roman Faith has long been established in these provinces, and so long as we Latins were alone in our devotion and obedience to the Holy Father we were respected by and at peace with our compatriots, but since we have taken to ourselves our Uniate partner we have suffered from dissension and cruel scandals. It would be better, it would seem, that we had done with him, for never has such injury been done to us as by this Unia.

You will to close forcibly and to seal up the heretics' churches? That in itself is a violation of brotherly charity. But show us, your Grace, the person whom you have converted by these methods of austerity.

You cannot. On the contrary you have lost those who once rendered you obedience in Polotsk.

You have turned sheep into goats. You have brought ruin upon the State. You have involved every Papalist in danger.

Instead of joy your seductive Unia has caused us bitter grief. Disquietude, the ill-repute of the persecutor, vexation, these are the fruit, of your violent Unia.

If (which God forbid) the country should be shaken (and you have paved the way for that) I know not what would become of your vaunted Unia.

Therefore by the King's command I order that the Churches in Moghilev be unsealed and restored to the people that they may celebrate their rites in their own way. And if this be not carried out I myself by the King's authority will see it done. Jews and Tartars are not prohibited from having their synagogues and mosques. Yet you seal up Christian Churches because the people will not accept the Roman rule. Our strongholds, Novgorod, Seversk, Stariodub, Kozelets, and many other places are lost to us, thanks to the Unia, which is also the chief cause why the people of Moscow shun the Prince, as is evident from the letters of the grandees and other Russians sent from the Grand Duchy.

We will not have this Unia, which has done us much harm already, work our final ruin.

Having stated in answer to your letter my full views, I ask you to spare me further controversy.

Of the most high I implore for you a spirit of meekness and love towards your neighbour. LEO SAPEGA, Chancellor of Lithuania.

Archbishop Josaphat was assassinated soon after the receipt of this letter. Our Roman brethren may defend him against the narrow bigotry and harsh persecution with which he was charged in it. But they cannot contend that an appeal for Reunion issued as a memorial of him can be taken by the Orthodox as other than a threat.

DR. A. FORTESCUE'S "UNIATES."

The Uniate Eastern Churches. By Dr. Adrian Fortescue. Burns, Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. 1923.

The preface to Dr. Adrian Fortescue's Handbook on the Orthodox Eastern Church, 1907, promised the compilation of a similar volume, dealing not only with the *Lesser*

Eastern Churches, i.e., the so-called Nestorian Church of Persia, and the "Monophysite" Churches of Egypt, Syria, and Armenia, but also—he was, of course, a Roman Catholic—with "our much neglected brethren, the Uniates."

That undertaking was redeemed in 1913 by the issue of the author's *Lesser Eastern Churches*, but, perhaps because in the meantime he had realised that all the varying Uniates[1] could not be treated logically within the same covers as the non-Byzantine Churches of the East, perhaps because of space, but more probably because—for first and last the writings of Dr. Fortescue were polemic and propagandist—he had envisaged a new function which the Uniate could fulfil in the campaign for the subjugation of the East, he had enlarged his scheme, and, omitting reference to them in his second volume, proposed to add a third and separate volume upon Uniates of all kinds.

The completion of the trilogy, however, appears to have been too much for his powers, and the task was never completed.

Except for the case of the Italian, the Maronite, the Chaldee and, perhaps, the Melkite, the wealth of literature which is accessible, especially in Encyclopædiæ for the compilation of a book on the Orthodox or the "Lesser Churches" of the East, is non-existent in the case of the Uniates.

In consequence, though the *Lesser Eastern Churches* was published as far back as 1913, only a fragment of the third volume, and that the part which required less research, was ready when death overtook the author last year.

This fragment Dr. Fortescue's old colleague at Ware and literary executor, Father Smith, who was given plenipotentiary powers of decision as to whether he would use it as material for an exhaustive treatise or publish it as left by its compiler, decided rightly to issue as it came into his hands.

The fragment so printed consists of an essay in general on those now almost extinct Byzantines, of Italy here styled "Italo-Greeks," who accepted the Papal jurisdiction, of an account of the Maronites, which is sufficiently exhaustive, and of a less adequate sketch of the Melkites, i.e., that very small section of the Orthodox of Syria and Egypt who in the eighteenth century seceded to Papalism.

Seeing, however, that the Slav Uniates, who factually are the more important, and that the Maronite, Armenian and Chaldee Uniates, who historically are the more significant, are not dealt with in this book, it may well be reckoned a pity that Dr. Smith adhered to the more resounding and ambitious, though misleading, title, and published it as a description of *The Uniate Churches*.

In saying that Father Smith was undoubtedly right to publish the fragment as he found it, we are writing dispassionately.

Be it said to our shame that, except for Dr. Fortescue's books, there exists no compendious description of Eastern Christianity in the English language. None the less the ordinary British reader will obtain a far better impression of what the Eastern Churches are, and of that for which they stand, from the meagre literature which is available than from Dr. Fortescue's books.

That may read as sharp saying, but we do not think that an academic, as contrasted with a polemicist, Roman Catholic would dissent from it.

Dr. Fortescue had read widely, had travelled a little, and was possessed of scholarship fully sufficient to have produced valuable contributions to British knowledge of Eastern Christianity. He was also a competent liturgiologist and had some acquaintance with ancient Greek and Arabic. If he did not know modern Greek, Armenian, Coptic, Ge'ez, Syriac or any Slav tongue, there were plenty of books in Latin, German, French and Italian which he could and did read.

If men less well equipped and less enthusiastic have succeeded where he failed, it is because, first and last, he was a propagandist.

[1] However infinitesimal, a Uniate Church has been set up as an "opposite number" to every historic Eastern Church.

Since scientific historical investigation is in honour necessarily limited for the Roman Catholic, he was bound to make a *petitio principii* in matters such as the existence of the Papal claims in the first seven centuries and the awareness of the Easterns of that existence. For example, the published volumes of Dr. Aurelio Palmieri's *Theologica Orthodoxa*—a stupendous and stimulating work which cries to be turned into English—are written with that presumption. None the less we feel grateful to the author. He never rasps us; for his invariable object is to instruct his reader and to advance fair controversy.

Dr. Fortescue, however, writes always as one whose prime concern is to keep the Anglican from liking the Orthodox and the Orthodox from liking the Anglican. It is his function to convince them that they can never come together and that, if they did, they would be sorry. He is the literary preceptor of Père Michel d'Herbigny, of Father Woodlock, and of the skirmishers of Farm Street.

At times, as when he perorates in his *Lesser Eastern Churches* with a splendid tribute to the faithfulness of the Oriental Christian under persecution, we realise what service he might have rendered to Christendom and indeed to the cause he had most at heart, if he had controlled his *odium theologicum*. But if occasionally his pen be a dove's quill, there is always vitriol in his pigment, and in fact his lack of restraint and lavish use of sneering invective evacuates his writings of much of their value even as mere propaganda.

It may be conceded, indeed, that the use of such a method has some pragmatic vindication in the penny tract which aims at the acolyte, the lady-worker, and the weak-kneed ritualistic curate, nor, if he had confined himself to that type of literature, should we have thought it necessary to have noticed him. But he was a man, as we have said, of gifts. His books have obtained some vogue. And while that lasts it is inevitable, however, that, highly distasteful though the task has become, we should draw attention not only to their tone and temper, but also to their misrepresentation of the position of the Orthodox Church and the Separated Churches of the East.

Though the present volume does not present the same scope as its predecessors, it contains insolences, alike to the Orthodox and to the Anglican, which parallel the vulgar abuse of the Bishop of Guiana on p. 335 of the *Lesser Churches* or the bitter gibe—was there ever anything more nauseatingly indecent?—at the Orthodox of Constantinople who in 1453 rejected the Unia: "They . . . had said: 'Rather the Sultan's turban than the Pope's tiara'; and they have had their wish."—*Orth. East. Church*, p. 218.

Thus (p. 215) it tells us that "Totungi, having learned the right sort of patter for his audience . . . received Communion in an Anglican Church. Great was the joy of the Anglicans at this reunion of Christendom."

There are many such gems of discourtesy in the book, of which, seeing that it is posthumous, Father Smith would have done well to purge it.

The virulence which marked Dr. Fortescue's writings is not, however, the chief cause of our regret that they are sometimes recommended by Anglicans as text books of Eastern Christianity.

A distinguished Russian historian once compared them to the account which a mediæval Chinaman visiting contemporary Europe might give of its life and conditions. The comparison is approved by two considerations.

(1) To the end Dr. Fortescue would persist in talking about the Orthodox as if the same stiff, juridical, quasi scholastic method of Theological Thought which dominates the Latin, dominated them. It is probable that he really could not understand that the Greek Fathers of the first nine centuries disliked syllogisms and that Orthodox theologians are representative of them. The failure was due most likely to a genuine intellectual myopia which refused to perceive that what was plain to him might be rejected by someone else, but it was due also to the practical need of

the propagandist. The Easterns had to be represented as rebels against the Pope, and for that end it was necessary to exhibit them as having once accepted those principles which they themselves aver to be innovations but which the Papalist must at all costs maintain to have been general, if only in embryo, in the Œcumenic mentality of the Undivided Church.

The result is that anyone who gets his first impression of Eastern Christianity from Dr. Fortescue is liable to contract an obliquity of mental vision which will prevent him permanently from seeing things as they are.

(2) Dr. Fortescue was no doubt also tied by his premises less than by his propagandist necessity to maintain a certain presentation of history which would unsuit the Eastern. "An appeal to history is treason." But in his zeal he writes history as a bitter partisan. Compare for example Mgr. Batiffol's charming article in our issue of last month with Dr. Fortescue's virulent abuse of the Patriarchs Photios and Cerularios in *The Orthodox Eastern Church*, pp. 156–173 and 174–198.

Be it remembered that these two Patriarchs are included in the Orthodox hagiology and are the protagonists of Orthodox resistance to the Papacy.

That a twentieth-century Roman Catholic, professing to write a scientific account of Orthodoxy—and to no small extent (there's the pity!) equipped for the task—should copy the nasty habit of personal invective which characterised the libellists of the eleventh century and was preferred by the lampoonists of mediæval Latin monasticism to serious argument, is lamentable in the extreme. Everything horrid that has been invented about Cerularios and most that has been said against Photios is amassed by Dr. Fortescue and recorded as at least possibly true.

What would the Roman Catholic say if an Anglican who had undertaken to describe the Papal System to the Russians wrote *mutatis mutandis* as follows (pp. 100 and 158, *Orth. East. Church*) of Gregory VIII. or Leo XIII.: "But the unblushing (Cerularios) had many more lies to tell," and "First he (Photios) sulked; then he played the martyr, and finally used the words that our Lord had spoken at his trial, making a comparison that was simply blasphemous"?

Though these purple patches of "going for the other fellow's attorney" should serve to safeguard the intelligent reader from paying attention to the subtler misrepresentation of the Eastern case, it is surprising how even Anglican writers such as Dr. Langford James (art. Great Schism) in his valuable *Dictionary of the Eastern Orthodox Church* should have been affected by it.

And yet in its silences it is daring in the extreme. Who, for example, could read pp. 172–198 of the *Orth. East. Church*, especially the bold statement (p. 197), "In 1053 Michael Cerularius suddenly, for no reason whatever except apparently for some private scheme of ambition, declares war against Rome and the Latin West," and still imagine that for over 100 years the Papacy had been engaged in forcibly detaching Sicily and Southern Italy from their existing ecclesiastical and secular centre, Constantinople?

And yet even in Gibbon, who wrote long before scientific study of Byzantine history began, the fact that that forcible proselytisation produced Cerularios' indictment of Rome and so gave excuse for the excommunication of Constantinople by the Papacy, is clearly indicated.

The history of the whole period, it is true, needs to be written in the light of the many documents now available, and of the investigations of Diehl and others of the modern school of Byzantine study.

But that Dr. Fortescue was aware that there is another side to the case and did not lay the guilt of the Great Schism upon Cerularios' ambition in ignorance of the possibility of Papal aggression having furnished alternative causes will be plain to anyone who reads *The Uniates*, pp. 88–99.

Viewed from the Eastern standpoint Europe between the sixth and eleventh centuries was still theoretically part of the Œcumenical dominion. The Western

lands were factually outside the rule of the Cæsar, but they were within his proper legitimate jurisdiction. Old Rome was more or less in the same plight. When his word ran in it, then its Bishop accepted his normal and splendid but constitutional position in the Church. When it did not, then as finally when the rival Carlovingian Cæsardom was set up in 801, he advanced innovating and greater claims. Thus Old Rome was the centre of, and the North of Italy belonged to, a new system which was breaking free from and was inimical to the ancient Œcumenical order. It was palpable that, unless the impossible, as we now realise it to have been, happened and the Cæsar's rule universal was reasserted effectively, sooner or later that would happen which did happen and the West would reject him finally by setting up a rival Western exclusive Christendom. Therefore, from at least the reign of Constantine Pogonatos, the Emperors set themselves deliberately and successfully to detach the South of Italy, which in every other matter, secular and cultural, had Constantinople for its metropolis ecclesiastically from Old Rome, which was now no longer a centre of Œcumenical life but was becoming simply a Western capital.

The power of the Lombard and Norman swords enabled the Bishops of Rome to undo this work after its almost complete accomplishment.

That, from Dr. Fortescue's point of view, is obvious, but he should not hide the fact that from the Eastern standpoint they were not only wrong but were abetting Islam, the common minant enemy. As Cerularios saw things, all jurisdiction was derived through the Church, which could, if practical considerations required, withdraw territory from the Patriarchates, Rome included, which she herself had set up.

That Cerularios alone could have produced the Schism is patently impossible in itself, and that he was no more than the natural instrument and agent of the inevitable protest of the East, has been always the contention of the Orthodox.

Though it was long delayed, a stand against Papal aggression and invitation had to be made, and he was the man who in the end was forced by the persecution of the Byzantine Church in South Italy to make it.

We spoke above of the propagandist gain which the treating of the Uniates as a co-ordinated whole and not merely, as historically they are, as breaks-off from the various historic Churches of the East, appears to have presented itself to Dr. Fortescue after his first volume had been issued.

That gain would seem to be this.

The Uniates, as they regard themselves and as they are usually regarded rightly, are groups which have seceded from the various Eastern Churches, Orthodox and otherwise, and have been received corporately into union with the Papacy, but have been allowed to retain their rites slightly altered in the vernacular, and their ecclesiastical customs such as the marriage of their clergy in their entirety.

In fact, until a century ago they were unco-ordinated fragments ruled in delegation from the Vatican, and were often treated there as undesirable if necessary instruments of proselytisation.

In *The Uniates* Dr. Fortescue lifts them from this category and makes them an unity.

As he presents them, the position is inverted. They have begun to be the representatives of the historic Catholic Churches of the East and possess continuity with those Churches from ancient times.

Thus he writes: "At one time it must have seemed as if the Catholic Eastern Patriarchates had finally disappeared, leaving only Latins as the whole Catholic Church. Happily that never happened." (p. 5).

There is a myth in germ!

Except for the scanty survivors of the South Italians who on Dr. Fortescue's showing had never been out of Union with the Pope, there were no Uniates until the Maronites and a few Armenians accepted the will of their Latin masters, the Crusaders. The rest have all come into being in modern times, as the result of political pressure such as was applied in Galicia and White Russia by the Poles and the Hapsburgs, through the inducement of the privileges which French and Austrian protection brought them in the Ottoman dominions or as a consequence of unhappy and painful dissensions among Easterns themselves, and in no case as the fruit of theological consideration.

In fact, there is no continuity whatever between the modern Uniate Churches and ancient Churches which Dr. Fortescue suggests that they represent; the claims which he elaborates; for example that Bishop Cyril, the unsuccessful candidate for the Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch in 1724, carried with him the succession to that Throne, or that the Chaldee Patriarch did the same with that of Seleucia Ctesiphon, being as unconvincing as they are amazing.

If, however, Anglicans could be induced to see the Uniates as a solid and historic counterpart to historic Eastern Christianity, it is manifest that propaganda would be served in Great Britain. And if the Uniates themselves could be induced to think of themselves as an unity it would greatly enhance their value as the flying column of the Papacy in the East.

Hinc illa propaganda.

J.A.D.

A DEDICATION SERVICE.

On Sunday, March 23rd, 1924, at the Church of St. Peter and St. Paul, in the village of Preston, in the county of Rutland, were re-dedicated some portions of marble mosaic brought from the ruined church of St. John-in-the-Studion at Constantinople, and also a 17th-century alms-box which was bought in the Turkish bazaars at Constantinople, having been looted from a church in Smyrna.

The dedication took place during Evensong. The Psalms chosen were the 148th and the 150th; the first Lesson was Wisdom of Solomon, ch. iii., v. 1 to the end of v. 12, and the second Lesson was Revelation, ch. i, v. 9, 10, 11, and ch. ii., v. 8, 9, 10 (read consecutively); the Hymns included "Now thank we all our God," "Praise, my soul the King of Heaven," and "The Church's one foundation."

After the second Lesson the Priest (the Rev. O. L. Fowke) moved to the chancel step, and dedicated the mosaic pavement with this Prayer:—

"Almighty God, we beseech Thee to sanctify and bless the marble mosaic which now forms part of the floor of this church, and which, having been originally dedicated to Thy Service in Constantinople, was desecrated by the Infidel for 440 years, and is now restored to Christian use in this church. Grant that all who see it may be filled with love for Thee and Thy Church as manifested to us in Thy Son, our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. Amen."

After the service, an address on the history and present tragic condition of Christianity in the Near East was given by Mr. John Codrington, Coldstream Guards, who had been in the Allied Army of Occupation in Constantinople in 1922 and 1923, and who had brought the marble and the alms-box from there.

Eastern Church Books.